

# Concordia

## Theological Monthly

---

Vol. XIV

JUNE, 1943

No. 6

---

### The Reunion of Christendom

(Continued)

Examining the basic principle of unionism, "In essentials (fundamentals), unity—in non-essentials (non-fundamentals), liberty,"<sup>6)</sup> we need to call attention to some additional points. We have to point out, in the first place, that in urging the acceptance of their principle upon us the union-men occasionally misapply a sound principle of theology. It is good theology to distinguish between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, the fundamental articles being those which form the basis of faith, the non-fundamental articles those "which are indeed found in Scripture but are not the foundation or object of faith in so far as it obtains forgiveness of sins and makes men children of God" (Pieper), those parts "of the Christian doctrine which one may be ignorant of or omit and yet be saved" (Hollaz). The doctrine of the angels, for instance, is non-fundamental. Our faith in the forgiveness of

---

6) The reader will recall how the unionists apply this motto. Here is another typical statement. The United Methodist Church (of England), in its Response to the Report of the Lausanne World Conference, declares: "Even so, we do not anticipate that all differences in conviction can be adjusted. We are persuaded that *many questions will need to be left open* as not of the essence of the Christian Faith, but as questions on which Christians, without disloyalty to Christ, their Lord, may agree to differ." For instance: "This Conference sorrowfully recognizes that the Table of the Lord which should unite Christians is precisely that which frequently divides them, and it joins in the earnest prayer 'that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed.' It is, however, sensible that such 'full communion' is only possible if a *large freedom is allowed* in respect to the interpretations to be put upon the Sacraments." Then, what are the essentials? "The way to union will be found not primarily in a unification of thought about Christ and His saving purpose and method, but in a faith in Christ Himself as Savior and Lord—a faith that issues in an experience of salvation which is the common possession of all Christian believers, and in an allegiance to Christ which shows itself in the whole-hearted doing of all that is believed to be His will." (See *Convictions*, edited by Rev. L. Hodgson, pp. 40, 42.) That is sufficiently indefinite.

sin does not rest on the fact that the good angels serve us and the evil angels harm us. This doctrine comforts us, warns us, calls for the exercise of faith, and is therefore an important doctrine, but it has not, by far, the importance of the fundamental doctrines. This distinction is a good one. It is of practical importance. The Christian teacher must know which things come first in his preaching and instructing. Our distinction also answers the question whether a religious body is a Christian Church or not. It may deny non-fundamental articles, but as long as it teaches the fundamentals, we are assured that there are believers in its midst; it is a Christian Church. (See F. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 102. J. T. Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 56.)

This distinction, however, does not mean that while there must be unity in fundamentals, there is liberty in non-fundamentals. The fact that one doctrine is of less importance than others does not and cannot mean that this doctrine may be ignored or denied. "It is self-evident," says Pieper, "that the purpose of distinguishing between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines cannot be to grant a dispensation from accepting certain doctrines of the Bible. No man has this right; yes, it is expressly forbidden in Scripture." (*Op. cit.*, p. 89.) But now we find that unionists are doing this very thing. They use the legitimate distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines to break down our resistance against the wicked principle: In non-fundamentals liberty. They attempt to befuddle the mind of the people with the illogical argument: since men are saved in a church which denies certain non-fundamentals, why do you insist on the necessity of keeping these non-fundamentals pure instead of treating them as indifferent and unimportant? A classical example of such argumentation was furnished by the Great Elector, Frederick William I of Brandenburg, in his attempt to unite the Lutheran and the Reformed churches. After forbidding controversial sermons and the like, "the climax came when, Aug. 21, 1662, he ordered the Lutheran pastors to meet the Reformed ministers for a discussion of the question 'Whether there was anything taught in the Reformed Confession because of which the individual who believes and teaches it must be condemned by divine judgment or whether in the same there was anything denied or omitted the unacquaintance with which on the part of an individual will make it impossible for God to save him.'" "Again you see," comments Prof. Th. Hoyer, "the footprints of Calixtus and the Helmstedt theology: the fundamentals of religion are the doctrines necessary for salvation; where men agree on these, a union may be established. The Elector had worded his question adroitly, and the plan, of course, was evident. He asked: Can a member of the Reformed Church be

saved? When this had to be admitted, he drew the conclusion: Then the differences are unessential; unite on the fundamentals. Just like the present-day unionists the Elector would not or could not see the fallacy involved in this conclusion. In the matter of church union it is not at all a question of what or how much the individual must believe in order to be saved; there the point is: the Church is obligated by Christ to teach men to observe all things whatsoever He has commanded them. A union with a church which by its own plain confession does not teach all that Christ has commanded is disobedience to His Word. A move of that kind would be based on indifferentism." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1938, p. 26.) — It is a rather clumsy fallacy; to say that a doctrine is not of the first necessity is not saying that it is not necessary at all.

Dr. Walther wrote much on the matter of non-fundamentals. And he knew full well that there are true Christians who are in error regarding some non-fundamental articles. He was ready to bear with them in great patience. (We shall take this up once more in the final installment of this series, on the *Christian* reunion.) But he did not commit the fallacy of the Great Elector. He declared: "No man has the liberty, and to no man may liberty be given, to believe or teach differently from what God has revealed in His holy Word, whether the matters in question pertain to primary or to secondary fundamental articles of faith, to fundamental or non-fundamental doctrines, to matters of faith or matters of life, to matters of history or other things that are subject to human investigation, to important or apparently unimportant things." (*Lehre und Wehre*, 1868, p. 298. See the entire series of propositions, translated in *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, XI, p. 298.) On page 112 of *Lehre und Wehre*, 1868, we have this statement of Dr. Walther: "Would men actually try to bring about peace by declaring a matter to be an open question simply because it does not concern a fundamental article of faith? Which man, which angel can give a dispensation from obeying God's Word? Is it not Antichrist alone who arrogates this right?"<sup>7)</sup>

A clear mind can easily grasp both propositions: 1. The articles of faith differ as to their importance; 2. The articles of faith

7) Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Winchester, writes: "Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connection with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between 'fundamental' and 'non-fundamental' articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive the authority of God revealing, and this allows of no such distinction." (*The Reunion of Christendom*, Marchant, p. 22.) At the Malines Conversations "an attempt to draw an abstract distinction 'between fundamental and non-fundamental articles' was turned down by the Roman Catholics." (*Ibid.*, p. 173.) — This does not contradict Walther's statement concerning Antichrist. Nor does it prejudice his case.

do not differ as to their binding force. Dr. Pieper could do it. "One must certainly distinguish between the articles of faith revealed in Holy Scripture. There are doctrines which every Christian must know and believe; saving faith cannot exist without the knowledge and acceptance of them. Then there are doctrines which one through weakness may fail to know; yes, concerning which he harbors errors and still may remain a Christian. This distinction is very important for answering the question who may still be a Christian. But when the question is what sort of unity in the faith the Lord demands, no distinction between doctrines may be made. Here the Lord says that *all* doctrines revealed in God's Word must be accepted by all." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1888, p. 10.)<sup>8)</sup>

We shall have to point out, next, that the principle "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty" springs from, and operates with, doctrinal incertitude. Unionism does not want men to be certain of some of the teachings, of many of the teachings of their Church, and of their own teachings. In the atmosphere of unionism men have come to believe that the lack of conviction in the field of doctrine is a virtue. Unionism asks men to be sparing with "affirmations"; in essentials, yes; but in the realm of non-essentials as little of them as possible. In this realm uncertainty and doubt must rule.

Are we saying too much? The motto "made popular in the 'Reformed' branch of the Evangelical Reformed Church by its most famous theologian, Prof. Ph. Schaff, is: 'In essentials unity;

8) Dr. M. Graebner is equally clear. We read in *Proc. S. Nebr. Dist.*, 1939, p. 27 ff.: "That is the way unionism began among the sects of our own country. . . . The question immediately arose, What are essentials and what are non-essentials? . . . We sharply distinguish between non-fundamental doctrines and open questions. A non-fundamental doctrine still remains a doctrine, a teaching, and while we do have a right to ascribe greater importance to some doctrines than to others, we have no right to make any difference in their authority. . . . To summarize our position as to true unity: 1. True union demands common adherence to all clearly revealed doctrines of the Holy Bible whether fundamental or non-fundamental. . . ." (*Proc. S. Nebr. Dist.*, 1939, pp. 27 f., 33, 37.) — The fourth proposition reads: "True unity does not demand unanimity in open questions, that is, in matters not clearly taught in the Holy Bible." (P. 37.) In the discussion of "essentials and non-essentials" some have used the term "non-essential" as denoting matters left to the decision of Christian liberty. With these men we have no quarrel. In the article "Essentials for Church Unity" (*The Living Church*, June 4, 1941) the statement occurs: "The ancient Liturgies, the customs and traditions handed down through the centuries from the Fathers, these are dear to reverent souls, but if by sweeping them away we could really bring all Christians, or any considerable part of them, together in the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ, we could not in loyalty to our Lord hesitate." In such non-essentials there certainly is liberty. "It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should be everywhere alike." Augsb. Conf., Art. VII. Form. of Conc., Art. XI, 5.



in things doubtful liberty; in all things charity.'" (*The Christian Century*.) "Schaff and Nevin, representing the mediational theology of Germany, of which Schleiermacher was the leader, . . . popularized the motto of Meldenius: *In necessariis unitas; in dubiis libertas; in omnibus caritas*—in things necessary unity; in doubtful things liberty; in all things love." (*The Luth. Ch. Quart.*, 1942, p. 276.)<sup>9)</sup> What is the meaning of "doubtful things," which Schaff substituted for the original "*non-necessariis non-essentials*"? It cannot mean that in things in which Scripture is silent—open questions, ceremonies, etc.—Christian liberty obtains. Nor that on dark and doubtful passages of Scripture different interpretations are permissible. It did not take the prophetic voice of Meldenius to inculcate that. No, Schaff makes a distinction between the *doctrines* of the Bible and demands that some of them—the essentials—be accepted by all, but would have those in which, say, the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches differ called non-essentials or, preferably, doubtful. That must be his meaning; else his motto would be useless to the unitists. The context, too, shows that. For on page 645 we read: "Zwingli thought that differences in non-essentials, with unity in essentials, did not forbid Christian brotherhood. 'Let us,' he said, 'confess our union in all things in which we agree. . . . There will never be peace in the churches if we cannot bear differences in *secondary points*.'" And those doctrines, the doctrine, for instance, of the Lord's Supper, Schaff and *The Christian Century* and all the unionists call "doubtful things."

We are not saying too much when we state that the unionists classify all those doctrines on which the Christian churches differ as "doubtful things." They say it themselves. There is no room for doubt as to the Lordship and Saviorship of Jesus, but as for the other doctrines, Lord's Supper, Baptism, Means of Grace, Inspiration, the Grace of God (limited or universal? *Sola gratia*, or *gratia infusa*?), Conversion, etc., the matter is doubtful; no man may speak with finality on these teachings; Scripture itself is not clear here; before God has, somehow or other, clarified these Scripture statements, one interpretation is as good as the other. We heard John Dury say: "Agreement in the essentials is sufficient and the differences should be tolerated until the Lord give further enlightenment." We hear Charles S. Macfarland declare: "The fact is the last word was not spoken yesterday and will not be today. It is a vain search. . . . Let us have all the Creeds, for

9) Schaff writes: "On the origin of the sentence: *In necessariis unitas; in non necessariis (or dubiis) libertas; in utrisque (or omnibus) caritas*. This famous motto of Christian irenics, which I have slightly modified in the text," etc. (*History of the Christian Church*, VI, p. 650.)

all the light they give, but let us not call them 'faith.' Let theology remain the queen of sciences, but perhaps the noblest achievement of the human intellect is the realization of its fallibility and frailty. . . . We shall not reach unity of faith by discussing *filioque* and *homoousion* with the patriarch of Constantinople or the difference between *ex opere operato* and *sola gratia* with the Committee of Archbishops or by reasoning on *hoc est corpus meum* with the Lutherans." (*Christian Unity in Practice and Prophecy*, p. 158 f.) Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1930: "With this penitence must be combined the humility in which each Church is willing for a change of mind in regard to its customary teaching in one respect or another. If these customary teachings are to be combined in the united Church, they will inevitably be to some extent reshaped in the process. But the humility required must go further; it must lead to a readiness on the part of each Church to admit that in some respects it may have been wrong." (*Op. cit.*, p. 372.)<sup>10</sup> How much of our doctrine is true and certain? The unionist cannot say. Which Church is right? He cannot say. He says with Longfellow: "Lutheran, Popish, Calvinistic, all these creeds and doctrines three extant are; but still the doubt is where Christianity may be." And the unionists are ready to console themselves with the thought: "Perhaps all can be right, even though they differ. . . . There is no unalterable doctrine . . . no system of doctrine which shall be valid to all eternity." (*The Christian Century*, Feb. 10, 1937.)

10) The unitists are unable to make definite statements even on such an important point of doctrine as *Sola Gratia*. The pamphlet *The Theology of Grace* contains the report of the Theological Committee appointed by World Conference on Faith and Order, Lausanne, 1927. We read on page 27: "*Sola Gratia*. The Reformers emphasized the principle that salvation is due wholly to God's Grace in Christ, in opposition to self-righteousness and the doctrines of merits; the Roman Catholic Church has attempted to define more and more exactly the limits between Grace and human action respectively." Well, who is right? The report goes on: "We agree, however, that the marvel of human salvation by the Grace of God cannot be reduced to any precise intellectual calculation, and that it may be described alike as the sovereign activity of the Grace of God in Christ and as His awakening of man's spiritual powers to a life of personal freedom and responsibility." That means that this doctrine cannot be expressed in precise terms; the thing must remain hazy and uncertain. — The Report adds this thought: "Finally, in the course of our discussions it has become increasingly apparent that there are marked differences of emphasis and expression between different Churches on their formulation of the message of the Gospel concerning Grace. These differences have arisen in the course of history and imply to a certain extent differences of racial temperament, religious experience, and historical environment. We wish, therefore, to record our conviction that, provided the different Churches agree in holding the essentials of the Christian faith, such differences would form no barrier to union between them." Note that *Sola Gratia* does not belong to the "essentials" in which there must be unity; it is one of the "non-essentials," "the doubtful things."

Dr. Walther was not wrong when he said: "Even in circles of so-called believers people act as if they were shocked when they hear some one say: 'I have found the truth; I am certain concerning every doctrine of revelation.' Such a claim is considered a piece of arrogance. . . . The professors say warningly to their students: 'Never speak of the Christian doctrine in terms of finality.'" (*Law and Gospel*, p. 30.) Likewise *The Watchman-Examiner*: "Once we stood for certain definite principles and proclaimed them positively, and our message carried conviction. . . . Now we have come upon the blessed day of the 'open mind,' which means that we have no convictions any more, but opinions only; that is, that we hold our faith so lightly that we can easily let go of it and take hold of some other notion if the wind of popular favor changes; we are 'blown about by every wind of doctrine,' as the uncompromising Apostle says. . . . Among our scholars we have the scholar's hesitancy that prompts such uncertain utterances as these: 'I am inclined to believe the Virgin Birth,' etc." (See *Theological Monthly*, 1927, p. 302.)<sup>11)</sup>

The doctrines on which the churches differ, say the unionists, belong to "the doubtful things" because the differences are due to different interpretations, and since one interpretation is as good as the other, since both are *human* interpretations, there can be no certainty of doctrine on these points. It would be wicked, they say, to invest one's interpretation with divine authority. The Reformed interpret the words: 'This is my body' differently from the Lutherans; hence the doctrine of the Lord's Supper must be classified as 'doubtful,' 'non-essential,' concerning which there need not be unity. Dr. A. Ray Petty declares: "The time has surely come for us to set aside our outworn divergencies and to discover our eternal agreements. . . . Jesus does not lend his support to any one type of interpretation. . . . Let us forget some things non-

---

11) K. Barth thus describes the doctrinal flabbiness inherent in the Reformed and modern Protestant theology: "There is no such thing as Reformed doctrine, except the timeless appeal to the open Bible and to the Spirit which from it speaks to our spirit. Our fathers had good reason for leaving us no Augsburg Confession, authentically interpreting the word of God, no Formula of Concord, no 'Symbolic Books' which might later, like the Lutheran, come to possess an odor of sanctity. They left us only *creeds*, more than one of which begin or end with a proviso which leaves them open to being improved upon in the future. The Reformed churches simply do not know the word dogma, in its rigid hierarchical sense. . . . The question of right doctrine cannot be opened up without the discovery and the acknowledgment of a great *perplexity*. Perhaps it is the greatest of all perplexities. Our disparagement of 'doctrine' is the fox's disparagement of the grapes. *Had* we something more essential and authoritative to say, *had* we a theology convincing to, and accepted by, definite and increasing groups of people, *had* we a gospel which we *had* to preach, we should think differently." (*The Word of God and the Word of Man*, pp. 220, 229 f.)

essential that have separated us." (See *Watchman-Examiner*, June 12, 1930.) The Lutheran Church has no right to charge the Reformed with false teaching on the Lord's Supper, says *The Luth. Ch. Quarterly*, 1942, p. 105 ff., since the Reformed interpretation may be just as good as the Lutheran interpretation: "The synods affiliated with the Synodical Conference have taken their stand unreservedly on the principle that there cannot and shall not be any altar or pulpit fellowship with members of the Reformed faith; for the peculiarities of the Reformed Confessions are looked upon, not as a possible understanding of the Scriptures different from the Lutheran interpretation, but as a perversion of Scriptural truth. . . . The Lutheran Church differs from the Reformed Church in its interpretation of doctrine; in the opinion of the Missouri theologians, the Reformed interpretation departs from the Word of God, and any kind of fellowship whatsoever with false doctrine, they maintain, is forbidden by God and detrimental to the Church. . . . When these theologians speak of false doctrine, they, of course, assume that their own interpretation of the Bible is absolutely free from error." The idea is that no man can be sure that he understands Scripture correctly so long as others understand the passage differently. Since Calvin interprets John 3:16 as teaching limited grace, our understanding of it as teaching universal grace may be wrong. Hence all the distinctive doctrines belong to the "doubtful things," concerning which there must be liberty. Dr. Walther describes the situation exactly: "What a long list of doctrines which they allege are not clearly and unmistakably revealed in Scripture! But the principle that Scripture contains doctrines of faith which are not clearly and unmistakably revealed and must therefore be counted as open questions inevitably leads not only to unionism and syncretism, but also to thoroughgoing skepticism and indifference in doctrine, even to the most shocking unbelief. . . . What is the language of the unionists, all the way down the line to the most rabid unbelievers, when they are confronted with the letter of God's Word? 'Yes,' they say, 'those words are indeed written, but who will incontrovertibly prove to me that your or my exposition is the correct one? Does not all strife in Christendom arise out of human interpretation?'" (See *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, 1939, p. 833.)

What of this theory that a lot of our doctrines are vague and hazy, uncertain and doubtful, and that the attitude of him who is certain of the truth of his teaching smacks of presumption and self-conceit? St. Paul did not hold this theory. He admonished Timothy: "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of" (2 Tim. 3:14), and he asked the preachers to "hold fast the faithful word" (Titus 1:7) and wanted the Colos-

sians to be "established in the faith, as ye have been taught" (Col. 2:7). And Luther held with Paul: The word, which is "faithful," πιστός, certain, reliable, produces not doubt, but certainty in the Christian. "*Homo est certus passive, sicut Verbum Dei est certum active*. . . . Faith is, and must be, a standfast of the heart, which does not waver, flutter, quake, shake, or doubt, but stands fast and is sure of its case" (III:1887). St. Paul believed in affirmations and assertions. Titus 3:8: "These things I will that thou affirm constantly" ("Concerning these things speak with confidence"). And Luther believed in affirmations and assertions. "Not to believe in assertions is not the character of the Christian mind; nay, he must delight in assertions, or he is not a Christian. . . . I speak of this that those things must be firmly asserted which God has revealed to us in Holy Scripture. . . . Allow us to be assertors and to study and delight in assertions, and do *you* favor your Skeptics. . . . The Holy Spirit is not a skeptic" (XVIII:1675 f.). "We are sure," says the Lutheran Church, "concerning our doctrine and confession," sure concerning the *distinctive* doctrines of the Lutheran Church. (Preface, Book of Concord, p. 21.)

To take a different attitude would be saying that Scripture is not reliable in many of its doctrinal statements. It would be saying that Scripture is not a clear book. It would be upholding the Popish claim that Scripture is obscure and in need of the interpretation of men. No, we are sure concerning our doctrine and confession and will not become guilty of the blasphemy of saying that certain doctrines of God's Word cannot be held with assurance. To be sure, your and my "interpretation" may be fallible. But we are not offering you our "interpretations," but God's own word, the word as it stands, the clear word which needs no human interpretation. Dr. Pieper: "Die lutherische Kirche behauptet nur deshalb, im Besitz der gewissen ganzen Wahrheit zu sein, weil sie das gewisse ganze Wort Gottes annimmt, wie es lautet." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1888, p. 18.)

Have done with this foolish talk of doctrine resting on human interpretation! Do not tell us that because the Reformed theologians have a different interpretation from ours, we must begin to doubt the truth of our doctrine. We are telling you that our doctrine of the real presence is not derived from our "interpretation" but rests on the plain Scripture. We are not going to tell our people that they need something beyond the text itself to establish their faith.

We might also point out that the principle under discussion is not observed in earthly affairs. No scholar of any standing, no scientist, philosopher, statesman of any standing will wait till all have come to share his own views before he forms any definite



conclusion. The fact that a statesman finds much opposition to his plan does not, of itself, shake his convictions. But let that go! What is of supreme importance is that the principle under discussion makes *all* doctrines doubtful. You are saying that these "non-essential" doctrines, those on which the Lutherans and the Reformed differ, are doubtful because it is all a matter of different interpretation. Then what about that doctrine which the Lutherans and the Reformed consider essential, justification by faith without works? You cannot appeal to Rom. 3:28, because the Catholics have a different "interpretation" of that text. And what about the doctrine which the Lutherans and the Reformed and the Catholics consider essential, the deity of Christ? You cannot appeal to Rom. 9:5 and John 20:28. The Unitarian will say: I have found a different interpretation of these texts.

We agree with *The Lutheran Companion*, May 19, 1934, when it says: "Denominationalism is the embodiment of a sincere interpretation of Scripture." We certainly believe that the Reformed think they are right in their interpretation of the Words of Institution. But certainly their sincerity cannot change the text. Nor can it unsettle our conviction. And it is a monstrous proposal that we should give up our convictions—declare the distinctive doctrines doubtful—for the sake of mere external union. We heartily agree with what *The Lutheran Companion* says further on: "But to seek unity by ignoring real differences of convictions would be to violate individual consciences and a virtual denial of the truth; would confuse honest souls and be nothing but hypocrisy. To compromise one's honest convictions is worse than debasing the coin of the realm. If the latter destroys confidence and credit, the former destroys faith in the revelation of truth itself."

Is doctrinal incertitude, called for by the slogan "In things doubtful, liberty" a good thing? *The Lutheran Standard*, May 20, 1933, answers: "To work or worship with others with whom we are not one in doctrine is unionism, and those who practice unionism must be said to be 1. ignorant of doctrinal differences or 2. *possessed of no firm convictions* as to truth and error or 3. indifferent to divine truth. No. 1 is inexcusable. No. 2 is *contrary to God's admonitions*; see Eph. 4:14; 1 Cor. 14:7; Heb. 13:9. No. 3 is sin; see Rom. 16:17; Jude 3; 2 John 10, 11."

It is contrary to God's admonitions, and it inflicts untold harm on the Church. Dr. Walther: "The unionistic bodies imperil the Church more than the worst sect; for the worst sect at least acknowledges that nothing but the pure doctrine ought to be preached in a church; but unionism stands for the pernicious principle that *man can never find out and possess* the pure truth and that, consequently, contending for the truth is wrong." (*Epistle Postil*,

p. 77.) *The Living Church*, Oct. 26, 1938, asks men to heed the warning uttered "by Bishop Perry of Rhode Island, in the foreword of his book 'Affirmation': Christianity in our time is subject to two dangers. One is the frontal attack of skepticism, attempting to overthrow the faith. . . . The other menace, more deadly to the Church and proceeding from foes in its own household, is an uncertainty of thought which undermines the foundations of belief." The Church needs men who stand up for the truth and certainty of all Scripture doctrines and will not permit any of them to be treated as doubtful. "Oh, for that fire of deep, honest conviction which burned in the hearts of our fathers and made them love and cherish the doctrines of the Bible as an immovable and everlasting foundation! Their firm conviction amounted to a consuming passion for the sacred teachings, which would not entertain the thought of a compromise with the gainsayers. Where you have such staunch convictions, unionism does not find a fertile soil." (Dr. W. Arndt, in *Theological Monthly*, 1926, p. 326.)

The motto "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty" is, finally, the voice of indifferentism. Doctrinal indifference, which goes hand in hand with doctrinal incertitude, "equalizes all religions and gives equal rights to truth and error." (See Webster's Dictionary.) It declares the doctrinal differences of the Christian churches to be unimportant and grants men the right to reject or accept this or that teaching without prejudice to their standing in Christian theology. And unionism is essentially indifferentism. Dr. Pfotenhauer states: "Das Wesentliche des Unionismus ist, dass man Lehrunterschiede gering einschätzt und grundsätzlich den Unterschied zwischen Wahrheit und Irrtum aufgibt." (*Lutheraner*, 1936, p. 339.) And Dr. M. Reu wrote in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, June, 1939: "Until his dying day Melancthon undoubtedly held to the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, even though he was ready to unite with Calvin in one church. That is often the case in unionism, for by entering such a union an individual need not give up his own convictions, but merely tolerates another viewpoint. Doctrinal indifference is both the root and the result of unionism." What do the unionists say to this charge? "F. J. Stahl, in his famous book *Die Lutherische Kirche und die Union*, speaking of the Prussian Union, has probably found the shortest definition for church union: 'uniting of Lutheran and Reformed churches by treating their doctrinal differences as indifferentials (declaring their doctrinal differences to be a matter of no importance or non-essential).'" (Dr. J. H. C. Fritz, *Religious Unionism*, p. 3.) And Stahl remained in the Union, held office in it, and insisted that the Lutheran Church must not leave the Union! Are the unionists indifferentists? Hear their

answer: "In non-essentials, liberty!" The distinctive doctrines are indifferentials! They may be waived!

For that matter, doctrine in general is an indifferent. "I would be glad," said the Federal Council president Cadman, "to see a holiday given to all theological speculation for fifty years." "A plague on all your doctrines," says Edwin Lewis, "is on occasion an understandable enough exclamation," and he speaks of "The Church's debt to heresy." (*The Faith We Declare*, pp. 146, 164.) C. S. Macfarland: "The way of Christian unity is so simple. . . . The Master elaborated no *corpus confessionum* of truth, no exact or exacting subtleties of doctrine, etc." (*Op. cit.*, p. 321.) *The Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry* asks the churches to get "away from sectarianism toward unity and co-operation, away from a religion focused upon doctrine toward a religion focused upon the vital issues of life; the exact formulation of doctrinal phrases will have less significance." And "it is clearly not the duty of the Christian missionary to attack the non-Christians' systems of religion." (See Macfarland, *op. cit.*, pp. 239, 246.) No *corpus confessionum*! No *lex doctrinae*! Union not by way of oneness in doctrine, but by way of "allegiance to Christ in the wholehearted doing . . . of His will." (See footnote 6.) In popular language, "No creed but Christ!" Is not life more important than doctrine? Why, even a Lutheran Church periodical protests against the statement that doctrine is the chief concern of the Church. "A synod which says that 'doctrine is the most important matter in the Church' and that 'indoctrination is her chief concern,' fails in the realization of the whole will of God." (*The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, 1942, p. 112.)

So, even the essentials do not mean everything; and when they get to the non-essentials, the slogan is: these doctrinal differences do not mean a thing. They do not form a bar to the reunion of Christendom. It is the duty of the Christians to ignore them. A crime was committed when the Church split on the question of the Real Presence; Verbal Inspiration is not so important that disagreement on it should keep churches apart. The Bishop of Winchester, Dr. F. T. Woods, wants the Christians "united in one organism, holding a common faith, united in the fundamentals, but allowing, and gladly allowing, very wide divergencies in secondary matters. . . . We are compelled to construct the framework of a reunited Church in which, through mutual self-denial and forbearance, room is made for our divergencies in reasonable proportion, but in which the members are drawn together in a unity which far transcends these divergencies." (Marchant, *The Reunion of Christendom*, pp. 108, 131.) You must get rid of these differences by ignoring them, said Peter Ainslie, head of the Christian Unity

League. "We can never reach Christian unity by discussing doctrinal differences. We can resolve doctrinal differences, if it is necessary to resolve them, only by affirming and practicing Christian unity. Doctrine is not prior to unity, but unity takes precedence over doctrine." And for that sentiment Editor C. C. Morrison praised him highly. (*Christendom*, 1935 [Autumn], p. 5.)

Get rid of this unnecessary baggage, says Georgia Harkness. "We must span the widest theological differences to express our common faith. . . . It is noteworthy that both the Twelve and the Seventy were little democratic fellowships, entrusted with a burning message, but unencumbered with superfluous physical or creedal baggage." (*The Faith By Which the Church Lives*, pp. 10, 118.) The Federal Council, the rallying point of the unionists in America, comes up to these specifications. It has cast off this superfluous creedal baggage. In its midst not only the distinctive teachings of the Protestant churches are treated as indifferentials, but also the difference between the conservatives and the modernists. Its Secretary Emeritus says so. "It is interesting to note the essential unity in the Federal Council between men known as modernists and those who are known as conservatives, excluding, of course, the violent extremes in both directions. . . . One of the most striking experiences has been the constant unity of these diverse elements. In the Council, on its executive and administrative committees, have sat side by side theologically liberal and theologically conservative members." (Macfarland, *op. cit.*, pp. 99, 156.) *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1943, p. 57, is fully justified in speaking of the "Federal Council's constitutional indifference over against all doctrinal, even strictly fundamental Biblical truths." Unionism is the incarnation of indifferentism.

The thoroughbred unionist wants doctrine and doctrinal discussions reduced to a minimum. He considers the time spent on studying doctrinal differences with a view toward removing them as time wasted; for these minor differences, he says, are not a bar to the reunion of Christendom. What did Peter Ainslie say? And Cadman? And the pity is that this impatience of doctrinal discussions is found also in Lutheran circles. Years ago a writer in *The Lutheran Observer* voiced a protest against holding a "doctrinal conference"; he was opposed to studying the Augsburg Confession article by article, "as though full unity in doctrine were necessary"; "the thing now in order would be a conference for practical fraternal co-operation." (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1888, p. 84.) And in *The Lutheran* of Jan. 20, 1943, we read: "The writers of this page" (Oscar F. Blackwelder and Ralph W. Loew) "believe the time for theological debate among Lutherans is far, far past. We hold that it is lack of intellectual poise to fail to see

the unity which now exists among Lutherans." <sup>12)</sup> — This antipathy to "theological conferences" is a clear symptom of the unionistic indifferentism. It is the logical application of the principle "in non-essentials, liberty."

It is not surprising that the indifferentists like the phrase "petty differences" (see statement at the beginning of this study) in denouncing those who insist that the agreement in the saving doctrine must be made the basis of the reunion of Christendom. We can well understand that men who hold that these doctrinal differences concern "non-essentials" have no patience with those who hold out for full agreement. C. M. Pfaff of old had no patience with them. He said that "the doctrinal differences between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches amount to a mere war of words." *The Lutheran Companion* of April 7, 1938, declared: "There are those who have begun to quibble about the words used in this 'testament' and about 'spiritual presence,' 'in, with, and under.'" E. S. Jones: "I was once pleading with a great crowd of Hindus and Moslems to see this living Christ, when I was flanked by the Christians. Before the great crowd of non-Christians they insisted on the literalness of the words, 'This is My body,' and they did it with much vehemence and bad temper. It all seemed so wooden! I could not help feeling that we were haggling over a statement about the literal body of Christ while the real Body of Christ was being torn to pieces before the non-Christians!" (*The Christ On Every Road*, p. 148.) *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1939, p. 259, describes the unionistic indifferentists thus: "In these days of lax thinking we often hear the exhortation: 'Don't quibble over non-essentials. Preach the Gospel, and don't be captious over unimportant details.'" *Lehre und Wehre*, 1871, p. 2, quotes men as saying: "Es handelt sich nur noch um ganz subtile Differenzen"; "um der 'vier Punkte' willen zu streiten, ist mikrologische Haarspalterei." But bear in mind that these terms, "subtle differences," "micrological hairsplitting," "trivialities" are employed also in connection with very essential matters, with the

12) The sentence preceding the one quoted is: "One of our Washington colleagues asked this question at the close of Dr. Ralph H. Long's address [on the National Lutheran Council], 'Where do you suppose the priest and the Levite were going when they passed the broken and robbed man on the road to Jericho in Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan?' Our colleague thought they were perhaps headed for a theological conference to draw up some 'articles of agreement.'" — We might as well give also the statement preceding this one. "Since the only generation we have is the present, we see no reason for delaying an aggressive move for organic union within the framework of the Council. *If our fathers had the right to separate, their sons surely have the moral right to unite.* Why must certain ultraconservatives who 'are not ready' determine the speed of this movement?" We have not the time to analyze the sentence we italicized.



Lord's Supper, with Inspiration, etc. H. L. Willett: "The controversies over the inspiration of the Scriptures . . . creation or evolution . . . the meaning of Baptism . . . are ceasing to be counted worthy of causing divisions among the friends of Jesus. There is a growing sentiment that, if God is really concerned about matters of that nature, he is a trivial God." (See *The Christian Century*, Jan. 27, 1937.) The question of Inspiration a triviality? Even Lutherans speak in this strain. Prof. T. A. Kantonen: "Scriptural theology will not quibble over such questions as whether the Bible is the Word of God or contains the Word of God." (*The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, 1934, p. 114.) — *The Lutheran Herald*, Jan. 26, 1934, speaks of "straining at the gnat" and the article "A Common Denominator for Unity" (March 9, 1943) complains: "We will continue with our conferences, quibbling over correct ways of expressing our faith. . . . We must have our organizations, and they must be built upon distinctive articles of some kind or other in order that they may have a way of perpetuating themselves." *The Lutheran Standard*, Jan. 16, 1943: "Brush aside hairsplitting philosophies of doctrinal theology." "Dr. T. O. Burntvedt, president of the Lutheran Free Church, told the American Lutheran Conference: 'There is no Church where the differences which do exist are more magnified.'" (*The Lutheran*, Dec. 2, 1942.) — "Our petty divisions seem pitiful." "Our minor differences are not fundamental, moral, and religious differences." Etc. Etc. Now, if a man really looks upon the distinctive doctrines as non-essentials, he will be compelled to use the harsh language noted. But then we are compelled to characterize his attitude with the harsh term "indifferentism."

Indifferentism is opposed to polemics. Naturally so; for if the doctrine in question is a matter of liberty or of no moment, it would be morally wrong to engage in a controversy simply because somebody happens to disagree with you. And so unionism, which is constitutionally indifferentism, frowns upon, and anathematizes, doctrinal controversies. In unionistic society it is bad form to have polemics, to unmask and denounce false teaching. Within the Federal Council the conservative is not supposed to antagonize the Modernist. Why, not even the teachings of the pagan religions should be made the subject of controversy; much less may one attack the brethren for their "false teaching" on such minor matters as the Lord's Supper, Inspiration, Conversion, etc.

Controversy, they say, is an evil thing, and they like to give it bad names. Dr. Adolf Keller reported on the World Conference at Lausanne in this wise: "A large part of the time is given to devotional exercises, and it is deeply felt that unity is perhaps better prepared by common prayer than by the forging of common

dogmatic formulae whose elaboration is not seldom done in a tempest of *rabies theologica*." The keynote in Bishop Brent's opening address at Lausanne was: "Conference is self-abasing; controversy exalts itself. Conference is a measure of peace; controversy a weapon of war. Conference looks for unities; controversy exaggerates differences." (See *Theological Monthly*, 1928, p. 40 f.)

In days gone by, men took doctrinal differences seriously, but such "theological disputes belong to a kindergarten stage of religion. We ought to outgrow it and reach a matured religious consciousness which will take fundamental truth for granted and compel us to go forward to a higher stage of action. Love is the solution of world problems." (*The Living Church*, Feb. 28, 1931.) Twesten was glad that his age had outgrown the kindergarten stage, that, "while in the seventeenth century Paul Gerhardt resigned his office rather than to refrain from condemning" the Reformed errors, "there will be hardly any one found in Prussia nowadays for whom the Electoral edicts of 1661 and 1662 would require to be renewed" (Herzog, R. E., 16, 676. See the article in *Theological Monthly*, 1907, p. 107 ff.: "In Behalf of Paul Gerhardt and the Elenchus"). And what is the situation today? Charles Augustus Briggs: "Polemics, in the main, was unfruitful of good and only productive of evil. . . . Thus Polemics became discredited, and in modern Theology has been well-nigh abandoned. . . . It is not probable that Polemics will be much cultivated in this generation, for there is a remarkable lack of enthusiasm for the differences between the religious bodies among scholars really competent to distinguish them properly and to maintain them." (*Theological Symbolics*, p. 19 f.)<sup>13</sup> — The Christian Union Church near Nevada, Mo., has this motto over the pulpit: "Christian Union without Controversy." It should be inscribed in all unionistic churches.

They denounce controversy as wicked and harmful and praise "tolerance" as a great Christian virtue and the panacea for the ills of the disunited Church. If there must be "liberty in non-essentials," differing views must, of course, be tolerated, and if all practiced this mutual toleration, the reunion of Christendom would naturally be effected overnight. Hear Zwingli plead for tolerance. "There will never be peace between the churches if we cannot bear differences on secondary points." In the Age of Enlightenment,

13) Dr. Briggs naturally set great store by the slogan: "In non-necessariis, libertas." In an article on the origin of this axiom, in *The Presbyterian Review*, 1887, p. 496, he writes: "This sentence of wisdom and of peace has long been the watchword of Protestant Irenics. It is the motto of the Evangelical Alliance. . . . Baxter writes, Nov. 15, 1679: 'I once more repeat to you the pacificator's old despised words, Si in necessariis sit unitas; in non-necessariis, libertas; in utrisque, caritas, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae.'"

when rationalism was in flower, "tolerance" was the universal fashion.<sup>14)</sup> And it has not gone out of fashion. Tolerance is demanded in the name of love. Bishop Woods enforces his demand that "room be made for our divergencies" thus: "And this because we have tasted of the love of Christ." And on page 144 f. of *The Reunion of Christendom* Alfred E. Garvie declares: "If there is any useful and hopeful discussion of Christian Reunion, there must be an open mind allowed to others by those whose minds may be closed on these questions by their distinctive convictions. . . . If under the providence of God, with the guidance of His Spirit, different types of creed . . . have emerged, the conclusion is forced on us that uniformity cannot be insisted on, that liberty must be granted, that charity must be exercised." The Evangelical Methodist Church of France declares: "We believe that the Christian spirit of tolerance and brotherhood ought to make Intercommunion possible in all the Evangelical Churches." (See *Convictions*, p. 46.) Of the nineteen barriers to the reunion of Christendom enumerated by the January, 1926, *Christian Union Quarterly* the seventh is "Lack of theological liberality."

Bear in mind that the unionists are not asking for the tolerance which the *State* exercises in its political wisdom, but want the *Church* to grant equal rights to what may be wrong and what may be right. They take the position of the Prussian Elector who pleaded for "*mutua tolerantia* und *Vertraeglichkeit*" and favored those theologians in the Lutheran and in the Reformed Church who "have proved that the *dissensus* in the Evangelical parties is not fundamental and that a *tolerantia ecclesiastica* might well be established." (*Theological Quarterly*, 1907, p. 112.) Note also that when they demand toleration with respect to non-fundamentals, non-essentials, they have in mind what the old Lutherans call fundamentals, essentials. Why, we hear enough voices in the unionistic camp insisting on toleration for any kind of religious

14) J. P. Koehler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, p. 506: "Die Aufklaerung des 18. Jahrhunderts hatte folgende Merkmale: 1. Einseitige Wertschaetzung der Vernunft. . . . 3. Auflehnung gegen die Autoritaet der biblischen Offenbarung, woraus die Umsetzung von Glauben in Moralityaet und kirchlicher Indifferentismus (Toleranz) folgten." Fr. Uhlhorn, *Gesch. der Ev.-Luth. Kirche*, II: "Der Unterschied zwischen dem Christentum und anderen Religionen wurde fuer gleichgiltig erklart. An der Einweihung der Synagoge zu Seesen nahmen lutherische Superintendenten und Prediger, ein reformierter Geistlicher und katholische Priester teil. Das war wohl der Gipfel der Toleranz. Es ist nicht zu bestreiten, dass die Aufklaerung durch die Forderung der Toleranz sich unvergaengliche Verdienste erworben hat, aber diese Toleranz wurde zuletzt zur voelligen Gleichgiltigkeit gegen jede besondere Religion." (P. 66.) "Friedrich der Grosse ist der grosse Vertreter des Toleranzgedankens, den er selbst in die Worte gefasst hat: 'In meinem Lande kann jeder nach seiner Fassung selig werden,' aber diese Toleranz hat ihre Wurzel in der religioesen Gleichgiltigkeit des Koenigs." (P. 28.)

belief. William T. Ellis describes the situation thus: "A *Charming Heresy*. In our day's noisy intellectual circles it is very much the fashion to cry aloud the glories of tolerance. Some religious leaders even profess that tolerance is the fundamental virtue. It is the vogue to hold meetings of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews — and sometimes Hindus and Moslems and Confucianists are added — to sound aloud the pre-eminence of tolerance. According to this amiable cult, no one should ever try to change anybody else's belief. Missionary leaders declare that Christianity should not seek converts from other faiths, but should merely promote a better understanding of them."

Should one tolerate false doctrine? "False doctrine" — the unionists do not like that term, seldom use it. Where we speak of false doctrine, they speak of divergencies, different views, different interpretations, different emphases: and the other man's view is as good as yours. *Gleichberechtigung der Richtungen!* They will even say that we should be glad of these divergencies.<sup>15)</sup> Tolerance, then, would hardly be the proper term to use. We tolerate what is not so good but cannot well be avoided. The unionists, however, ask "tolerance" for that which in their view is good or may prove to be good. But let them use whatever word they wish, we know what they mean: they hold the fight for "pure doctrine" to be wicked intolerance. They make the difference in doctrine an indifferent. And they praise this indifference as a virtue.

That is "the alarming indifference to the Word of God as it manifests itself in the mighty movements to unite all churches into one large body." (Dr. Behnken.)

It is not a Christian virtue. It is an evil thing. It is disobedience to God's word and command and therefore outright sin. Recall the statement of *The Lutheran Standard*: "Those who practice unionism must be said to be 1. ignorant of doctrinal differences or 2. possessed of no firm convictions or 3. *indifferent to truth*. . . . No. 3 is sin. See Rom. 16:17; Jude 3; 2 John 10, 11." Would you say that Rom. 16:17 breathes doctrinal indifference? Does St. Paul say that it does not matter much what kind of doctrine would be

15) It is a good thing that the Roman Catholic Church has different views from ours. P. Althaus says so. "Die roemisch-katholische Kirche ist fuer uns *auch* eine besondere Gestalt der Kirche Christi, die ihre eigenen Gaben hat. . . . So begruendet die Erkenntnis des Nebeneinander individueller Gestalten auch fuer uns Duldung, mehr als Duldung, Freude an dem andern eben in seinem Anderssein." (Italics in original.) "Wir sind gewiss, dass die kommende Einheit nur so zustande kommen wird, dass die anderen auf *ihrem* Wege weitergefuehrt werden, nicht auf unseren uebertreten. Diese Aussicht begruendet Demut, Geduld, Toleranz in dem Ringen mit den anderen." (*Theologische Aufsätze*, II, pp. 116, 120.)

taught to his congregations? St. John, too, will not have his children display a careless, indifferent, neutral attitude as to what is preached in their pulpits and taught in their churches. He admonishes them: "Try the spirits. . . . Many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John 4:1. And St. Jude exhorts them to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," v. 3. For how much of the faith must the Christians earnestly contend? The Lord said: "Observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28:20. Not a word here about the principle that with regard to essentials care must be observed, but with regard to non-essentials liberty and indifference must rule. God's Word forbids us to tolerate any doctrinal error. It does not command us to shun controversy as something unbecoming the Christian. "Reprove, rebuke!" 2 Tim. 4:2. "Holding fast the faithful word . . . convince," convict, rebuke, "the gain-sayers!" "Rebuke them sharply!" Titus 1:9-13. Tolerance of error has no place in the Christian Church. "In the State it is in place; there patience must be exercised, and you must go easy. . . . But in the Church there must be no yielding to any sect, no yielding of one tittle of Scripture." (Luther, V:398.) "*Non valet neutralitas in regno Dei.* Matt. 12:30." (Bengel.) All long-suffering with the weak indeed, but no toleration of error!

St. Paul says: Hold fast the faithful word! Hold fast the sound doctrine! (Tit. 1:9.) And the unionist says: A plague on all your doctrines! — Indifferentism is not in accord with God's will. It is sinful.

Furthermore, indifferentism violates the sense of truth created by God's Word in the believing heart. Truth is intolerant of error, and the Christian, who loves the truth of God's Word, will not tolerate any infringement of it. He loves the truth (Zech. 8:19) and hates the lie (Ps. 31:6; 119:104, 113). He loves the truth as it is revealed in God's Word and cannot bring himself to suppress or ignore any teaching of it. He trembles at God's Word when it presents essentials, when it presents non-essentials. One little word of Scripture means more to him than all considerations of carnal wisdom and the alleged advantages of a false peace.<sup>16)</sup> But this spirit of truth cannot live in the unionistic atmosphere. Indifferentism deadens the Christian sense of truth, of loyalty to Scripture.

This indifferentistic tolerance sins against Christian charity, too. It is not Christian love when you refuse to rebuke the erring

16) Dr. Walther: "We do not separate ourselves from the errorists because we consider ourselves better than they. . . . But we consider God's Word as more worth than heaven and earth and would rather lose the friendship of all than lose this." (*Proc. Iowa District*, 1879, p. 39.)



and warn them against succumbing to false teaching. Dr. W. Koren, President of the Norwegian Synod, 1894—1910, made the axiomatic statement: "To our opponents we owe truthfulness, because we owe them love." And H. Sasse puts it thus: "We are serving neither our church nor any other church if we sink the teachings of our confessions in the deep sea of unionism which is today threatening to engulf entire denominations. Neither is it charity, at any rate not Christian charity, not New Testament charity, if one, in order not to hurt the feelings of the others, no longer makes an issue of truth or error." (From an article reprinted in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Feb., 1938, p. 125.) Dr. Walther: "Ach, das ist nicht Lieblosigkeit, sondern die wahre Liebe. If a scoundrel had poisoned the wells in our neighborhood and people came running to sound the alarm, would we say: What matters a little arsenic? . . . Why, these people are our best friends." (*Proc. Iowa Dist.*, 1879, p. 38 f.)<sup>17)</sup>

The tolerance lauded by the unionists is anything but a Christian virtue. William T. Ellis continues his discussion of it thus: "The defect in it [the demand for tolerance] is that it ignores the nature of truth and the clear commands of the Bible. Nor does it sensibly appraise the nature of tolerance; which, after all, is a second-rate virtue. Loyalty to truth necessarily takes precedence of it. Tolerance is only a virtue for those who first of all sincerely believe something. Tolerance, as a moment's clear thinking makes plain, is only a handmaiden of truth; a subordinate virtue for persons possessed of convictions. In the cold light of common sense, the attempt to make a religion out of the negative virtue of tolerance is rather ridiculous." (See *Globe-Democrat*, Feb. 28, 1931.) Prof. G. W. Richards is a leader in the Evangelical Reformed Church, which is merging with the Congregational Christian Church, and this is what he thinks of this tolerance: "Much has been said in praise of tolerance, which often is rooted in indifference and not based upon a firm and even defiant adherence

17) We ought to hear a few more of such Lutheran pronouncements. *The Lutheran Herald*, Feb. 24, 1931: "Because all departure from the true doctrine of God's Word is sin, you make yourself by the practice of unionism a partaker in the sins of others. And not that alone, but you are also confirming them in their mistaken conviction that there is nothing dangerously wrong about what they believe and teach. . . . If their activities bear all the earmarks of sincerity and of a deep personal piety, that does not lessen, but rather increases, the harm to the Church which their false teachings will do, namely, by increasing by so much the power of their influence to lead men away from the truth in the points of doctrine in which they teach falsely." C. P. Krauth: "To go to the same table with those whom we know to be in error in regard to any truth which Christ has revealed, is not only to hold the truth of Scripture cheap, but to make such persons all the more settled in their error or indifferent to the importance of truth."

to truth as it is heard and proclaimed by one or another Church. . . . Church union by tolerance, without change of mind and heart, for the sake of a show of power consisting of numbers, wealth, and regimentation, and in the hope of thus winning the world, is a snare and a delusion. Such a union would be far worse than sincere and consistent division. For a mere sentimental and thoughtless toleration is evidence not of strength but of weakness. Perhaps the tolerance of Voltaire is more to be deplored than the intolerance of Calvin. Luther may have been further on the way to true union of the churches when he said to Zwingli: 'You are of a different spirit from us' than Frederick the Great when he declared that every one should go to heaven in his own way." (See *Christendom*, 1939 [Spring], p. 267 f.) I. M. Haldeman: "The word 'toleration' must be cut out of the Church vocabulary. It is not a nice word. It is a word much used by middle-of-the-road men. It has in it always, no matter how much dissimulated, the crawling, creeping movement of surrender. It is, as a rule, the word of men who accept all sorts of treason against the Word of God, and then fight against every endeavor to repress that treason. It is a word under which conspiracy and treason have been hatched. . . . It is a word that is used again and again with that other word, 'interpretation.' To talk about the right of interpretation, to have any discussion about it, is simply playing the game of matching wits, or playing the fiddle while the penknife cuts and the fire burns." (*A King's Penknife*, p. 164 f.) — Religious toleration is a virtue when exercised by the State; when the Church grants immunity to false teaching, it becomes a crime.

And this sin of indifference is not a harmless sin. Its product is havoc and disaster. It plays havoc with the Christian doctrine. It may result in the loss of the whole body of the Christian doctrine. When a man applies the principle "In non-essentials, liberty," to one single unessential, he has broken down the authority of Scripture. And nothing but the grace of God can then keep him from applying it to all non-essentials and all essentials. Indifferentism is a cancerous growth which inevitably spreads. "Wer einmal indifferent ist," says Walther, "der geht immer weiter." Necessarily so; "when error is admitted into the Church, it will be found that the stages of its progress are always three. It begins by asking toleration. . . . Indulged in this for a time, error goes on to assert equal rights. It is bigotry to assert any superior right for the truth. We are to agree to differ. . . . What the friends of truth and error hold in common, is fundamental. Anything on which they disagree is *ipso facto* non-essential. . . . From this point error soon goes on to its natural end, which is to assert supremacy." (Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, p. 195.) The

cancer grows in malignity. And in extent. "Es ist ein teuflischer Anlauf, so fordert, dass man solle etwas weichen und einen Irrtum zugut halten; damit er uns sucht also listiglich vom Wort zu fuehren. Denn wenn wir solches annehmen, so hat er schon Raum gewonnen und bald eine ganze Elle genommen, da ihm ein Fingerbreit gewichen waere, und so bald gar eingerissen." (Luther, IX:832.)

When the authority and majesty of Scripture is weakened or destroyed, entrance is given to any and all error. It is because of this, that Luther uses such strong language in characterizing the unionist: "A teacher who will condone error and still claims to be a true teacher is worse than an outspoken Enthusiast and does more harm through his hypocrisy than a heretic." (XVII:1180.) And J. G. Machen declares: "The calamity [of Marburg] was due to the fact that Luther (as we believe) was wrong about the Lord's Supper; and it would have been a far greater calamity if, being wrong about the Supper, he had represented the whole question as a trifling affair. . . . Such indifferentism would have been more deadly than all the divisions between the branches of the Church." (*Christianity and Liberalism*, p. 50.)

It is not well that leaders of the Church belittle the danger and derisively speak of "hypothetical forebodings of what might happen." Indifferentism, letting down the bars at one point, imperils the whole body of doctrine.

And thereby brings disaster upon the Church. The Church is not served when false doctrine is granted equal rights with the pure doctrine. They do not build up the Church who give the errorists a free hand. Men who refuse to combat false doctrine are not benefactors of the Church. The true friends of the Church are those who are ready to take upon themselves the odium of theological controversy. "Let us picture to ourselves as vividly as we can the situation that would have been created in the early Church, when errorists like Arius, Nestorius, and Pelagius arose, if men like Athanasius, Cyril, and Augustine had not earnestly opposed them. . . . Again, suppose Luther, after learning the truth, had not entered into conflict with the Papacy, what would have happened? Christianity would have remained under the soul-tyranny of the Roman Antichrist, and we should all still be subjects of it." (Walther, *Law and Gospel*, p. 350.)<sup>18</sup> We must quote

18) In *Lutherische Kirche* H. Sasse quotes a similar statement from Walther's *Epistelpostille*, p. 468, and adds: "Vielleicht ist die Zeit nicht fern, wo sehr viele Christenmenschen, die uns heute noch nicht verstehen, begreifen werden, dass dies Feststehen der lutherischen Kirche, diese scheinbar dogmatische Borniertheit ein Segen fuer die ganze Christenheit gewesen ist." — We read in the *Proceedings of the Western District*, 1870, p. 55: "Wahrlich auf dem entschiedenen und fortwaehren-

one more statement from *The Lutheran Herald*, Feb. 17, 1931, which shows why the Church cannot thrive in the unionistic atmosphere. "Among all the dangers which threaten the existence of God's true Church on earth unionism is one of the greatest. And that for several reasons. In the first place, because comparatively few recognize it as a danger. . . . And furthermore, because it rests on a principle which in its very nature threatens to deprive the Church of the truth of God's Word, upon which the Church is built as on its divine foundation. It is founded on indifferentism, that is, indifference as to whether what is believed or taught is in full harmony with Holy Scripture or not. And this indifference, again, is a fruit of doubt as to the clearness and sufficiency of Scripture in all matters of saving faith. . . . 'If the perspicuity of the Bible and that certainty of faith which is built on God's clear Word are once brought into doubt, so that on account thereof it is considered a matter of small importance to be in full agreement in matters of faith, then it will not be long before one after another of the fundamental truths of Christianity are held in contempt and denied, and our people will for a time fill the churches of the Unitarians and the Universalists until they at last end in infidelity.' (V. Koren.)" <sup>19)</sup>

Indifferentism saps the Church of her strength. The strength of the Church is derived from the Word of God, from the sacred teachings of Scripture. Therefore "this very determined, inexorable tenacity in clinging to the pure teaching of the divine Word by no means tears down the Church; on the contrary, it is just this which builds up the Church." (*Law and Gospel*, p. 28.) And it is just this indifference of unionism which weakens the Church. For every doctrine of Scripture which a church body treats as inconsequential, indifferent, neutral, that body loses just so much

---

den Zeugen und Predigen der Kirche ruht mehr Wohlgefallen und Segen Gottes als auf allen kirchenpolitischen Experimenten und schriftwidrigen Unionistereien. Oder was waere wohl aus der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika geworden ohne rechtgläubige Synoden? Haetten sich vor fuenfundzwanzig oder dreissig Jahren die paar Lutheraner mit ihrem Glauben in den Winkel gesetzt, so gaebe es heute hiezulande schwerlich eine rechtgläubige lutherische Kirche." *The Proceedings* go on to show that the Lutheran Church, thus strengthened, exhibited great spiritual vigor.

19) Just by the way: It is not necessary that those who hold the Unitarian and Universalist beliefs join the Unitarian or Universalist Societies; they find a church home in those Protestant churches which have succumbed to indifferentism. *The Christian Century*, Sept. 24, 1941, points out that "the numerical growth of the Universalist denomination was early checked, chiefly perhaps by the increasing tolerance of orthodox bodies for the more generous doctrines of the liberals." While the Universalist Society has no representation on the Federal Council, churches which enjoy this representation gladly harbor Universalists. The same applies to Unitarianism.

of its spiritual vitality. And when indifferentism gets into its blood, it will die of anemia. In that condition it cannot perpetuate itself. It has nothing to transmit to its children. It is sterile. In the words of John Musaeus: "When such a union—based on indifferentism—claims to be a type of Lutheranism, it is a denominational neuter that cannot propagate its kind because there is no kind to be propagated." (See *Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1938, p. 26.)<sup>20)</sup>

As to the Lutheran Church, it cannot survive under indifferentism. Unionism digs the grave of Lutheranism. "Die Union ist," says Dr. E. Denef in *Kirchenblatt*, Nov. 13, 1937, "wie die Geschichte zeigt, allemal das Grab der lutherischen Kirche." The unionistic union requires the Lutheran Church to yield up its distinctive doctrines and become a mongrel. That holds good with any Church. But on one point it is only the Lutheran Church which loses out in the unionistic deal. The Reformed bodies, in general, are characterized by doctrinal indifference. The Lutheran Church stands for doctrinal purity and exactitude. And on this point the Lutherans have everything to lose, the others everything to gain. "Die Union ist allemal das Grab der lutherischen Kirche. . . . Fuer die lutherische Kirche ist auf diesen Weltkirchen-Konferenzen nichts zu holen. Der lutherische Erzbischof von Finnland sagte: 'In dieser Welt-Konferenz stellt man die Glaubensfragen beiseite. Die lutherische Kirche hat viel von den Sekten der Reformierten gelitten, und eine Hebung des lutherischen Glaubensbewusstseins waere vonnoeten, aber diese Welt-Konferenz wird eine solche nicht geben. Ihr Programm verspricht der lutherischen Kirche nichts Gutes.'"

Again and again the gravediggers had been summoned to prepare for the burial of the Lutheran Church. That has been going on for four hundred years. In *Here We Stand*, p. 179 f., H. Sasse points out how four hundred years ago the Lutheran Church was sentenced to death for refusing to come to terms with the Pope; how in modern times she was told that unless she were willing to give up her irrational dogmas and unflexible belief in

20) It follows that honest controversy is the mark of a vigorous church, the abhorrence of polemics the symptom of spiritual decay. Krauth: "A church which contends for nothing either has lost the truth or has ceased to love it." John A. Broadus: "It must not be forgotten that religious controversy is inevitable where living faith in definite truth is dwelling side by side with ruinous error." Machen: "Indifferentism about doctrine makes no heroes of the faith." (*Loc. cit.*) *Watchman-Examiner*: "The periods of exciting religious controversy, like those in which Athanasius, Augustine, and Luther engaged, have been epochs of intense spiritual vitality." Even *The Christian Century* was constrained to say on Oct. 28, 1931: "It is the idea that church papers should skirt 'controversial issues,' that they should be written in a milk-and-water fashion free from any hint of an 'aggressive spirit,' that has reduced many a church paper to colorless sterility."



the Scriptures, she must die; and how the unionists kept telling her that unless she was ready to introduce altar fellowship with the Reformed, she will perish from the face of the earth. And the Lutheran Church still lives! But mark this: if and when she dies, it will be by her own hand. If she succumbs to the spirit of indifference, compromising the truth of God's Word in order to gain the good will of men, she has dug her own grave. Hear the warning cry of Werner Elert: "Should our several Lutheran churches sell the birthright of the pure preaching of the Gospel for all kinds of syncretistic pottage, they would not only be digging their own grave, but would also defraud Christendom of the message which God has given to us in trust for all the others." (*Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung*, Nov. 18, 1927.)

This, then, is the Lutheran answer to the unionistic slogan: "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty," as given by Dr. W. H. Greever, editor of the *American Lutheran Survey*: "No part of the Lutheran Church can consistently practice unionism without disloyalty to the truth which it confesses and without unfaithfulness to the tasks which are specifically its own. . . . To concede any part of the revealed truth is to go against conscience and to become disloyal to truth, and to compromise it is to concede it. No part of the revealed truth may be conceded because of the unity of truth as well as because of the essential value of all truth." (See *Theological Monthly*, 1926, pp. 322, 324.) A Lutheran woman, writing in *The Farmer's Wife* (St. Paul, Minn.), gives the same answer: "When Lutheran Christians are criticized in these 'unionistic' days by their Protestant friends for their strict adherence to God's Word and are asked to join in forming one big united Church including all denominations, they show these friends how impossible and wrong that would be for them, for they would have to sacrifice clearly revealed truths of God's saving Word and thus prove faithless stewards of His sacred trust." TH. ENGELDER

(To be continued)

---

## Huldreich Zwingli, the Father of Reformed Theology

### II

In the doctrine of atonement Zwingli merely repeated the traditional language of the Church. Zwingli tells us that, long before he even heard of Luther, he learned from Thomas Wyttenbach, one of his teachers at Basel, that "the death of Christ is the sole price of the remission of sins" (III:544). This was nothing unusual, for such statements can be found in many Catholic writers before Luther. The eighteenth and nineteenth of Zwingli's Sixty-seven

Articles of 1523 read: "Christ, having sacrificed Himself once, is to eternity a certain and valid sacrifice for the sins of the faithful. . . . Christ is the only Mediator between God and us." (I:154.) He explains: "Inasmuch as He took upon Himself the punishment of sins . . . which cling to us because of the sin of Adam, and in order that divine justice might be satisfied, Christ was slain in all innocence because of our guilt and reconciles us to God." (I:310.) "Adam exposed himself through his sin to nakedness and necessity; so Christ, in order to placate divine justice, should experience want, cold, and all evils, which were inflicted on man because of sin. For this was justice, that He through whom we were all created, in whom there was no sin, from whom we had departed, innocently bore those things for us which we had deserved by sinning." (III:189.)

But Christ came "not only to redeem us but also to teach the true love of God and works which God requires of us" (I:180). Hence He is also the "Guide and Teacher promised by God to all human beings" (I:195), whom we should follow (III:194, 211). "Christ, therefore, inculcates everywhere these two things, viz., redemption through Him and that those who have been redeemed by Him ought now to live according to His example." (III:324.)

On faith Zwingli wrote: "Our faith which we have in God and in Christ Jesus makes us blessed. . . . Whoever believes, him God has previously elected and drawn. . . . Faith is nothing but to be dependent on God, for thus God has made a covenant with all the elect, that they pray to Him alone, worship Him (as God) alone, and cling to Him alone. . . . From which follows that to trust in the Lord Jesus Christ is to build our faith altogether on His deity. . . . We place our faith in Christ Jesus solely [because of the fact] that He is true God. Why, then, His humanity? It is a certain pledge of grace; which was therefore given into death that divine justice might be satisfied and reconciled to us, so that we may confidently run to the grace and mercy of God through the precious pledge of His own Son given to us." (II:II, 7.) Zwingli wrote these words in his *Friendly Defense*, addressed to Luther in 1527. Ritschl, *op. cit.*, III:59, rightly says: "Although Zwingli upheld the tradition materially, faith in Christ's work of redemption appeared merely as knowledge or historical faith and not, as with the Wittenberg reformers, as direct trust in Christ as the Mediator. In Zwingli religious trust directs itself solely to God and His gracious disposition and in Christ only inasmuch as He is God. Accordingly His humanity and His human actions were appreciated only as a pledge of the grace of God. Here Zwingli's fundamentally dualistic Christology reveals itself." In fairness, we agree with Ritschl when in a footnote he adds that Zeller goes too far in

maintaining that Zwingli regarded the death of Christ merely as a penal example.

On Zwingli's view of faith the following words throw some light: "It is to be remembered that the word 'faith' is taken in various ways in Holy Scripture; first, as credulity; then, as firmness; and finally, as confidence in God; of the last alone it must be understood that faith saves. He who does not see that faith, hope, and charity are the same thing, namely, this confidence in God, is compelled to leave many knots in Scripture undone. . . . That whole confidence of the human heart in God is therefore called at times faith, at times hope and charity, and is nothing but piety in God, be it that you love, hope, or believe." (III:285 f.) Here we have an altogether different conception of faith from that found in Luther after he began his reformatory work. It is the Catholic conception of faith as being hope in God and as including charity. Zwingli speaks of faith as that "love" which God "through His Spirit infuses in our hearts" (VI:II, 92). Faith, hope, and charity are "nothing but the heart inflamed in God"; and when Paul says that charity is the greatest of the three, he wants to say that "charity, that is, confidence through love, is absolution" (VI:II, 175). In opposition to the "dead faith" of the demons Zwingli knew only of a "faith operating through charity" (VI:II, 271 ff.), which reminds us of the Scholastic "faith formed through charity." Melancthon had not read the last quoted statements, and yet he did not unjustly accuse the Zwinglians at Marburg, "Improperly they also speak and write about the justification of man before God and do not inculcate the doctrine of faith enough, but they thus speak of justification as though the works which follow faith are the righteousness of man." (IV:185.)

Since Zwingli expressly says that by the Law "no man will be justified, i. e., will be just" (VI:II, 87), he seemingly taught justification by faith alone. Yet he did not share Luther's and Melancthon's ideas of justification. It is true, all three often used similar language, and yet his view was fundamentally different, for he did not go beyond Augustine's conception of justification through the infusion of grace. Zwingli once defined grace as "favor according to which God . . . forgives sin" (VI:II, 135); yet when he says that "salvation is solely in the grace of God, which has been exhibited in and through Christ" and which is "infused in the conscience and heart through the Spirit" (VI:I, 553), this is more in agreement with Augustine's view of justification. Zwingli did not understand "justification by faith" in the same sense as Luther did; and when he emphasized justification by faith "alone," this was done to exclude the thought that the Sacraments can justify or make gracious. (IV:33.) Zwingli ascribed justification and salva-

tion to faith only in an improper sense, for in reality it is election which saves, and faith is merely a "seal and pledge" of election.

With Zwingli justification consists essentially in trusting in God as the source of all good. Man ought to recognize that, even as his physical existence comes from God, so his salvation depends wholly on God, on His eternal and immutable election. It is true, Zwingli says that Christ is our redemption, but he looked on Christ primarily as the revelation of God's justice and a pledge of His mercy, whereby we are incited to have faith, hope, and charity. If man feels such confidence in himself, he has proof that he belongs to the elect of God.

As to Zwingli's teaching on the Church, one finds that he distinguishes between the visible and the invisible Church. He refers to this distinction in his *Exposition of the Christian Faith*, when he says: "We believe in one holy Catholic, i. e., universal Church, that it is either visible or invisible. . . . It is called invisible because it is not revealed to human eyes who believes; the faithful are known only to God and to themselves. . . . But the visible Church [includes] as many as have given their name to Christ throughout the earth. . . . In the visible Church are such as are not members of that elect and invisible Church." (IV:58.)

Since the "visible Church has within itself many contumacious and traitors," and since "shepherds" are designated in the Church as "princes, it is established that the Church is infirm and maimed without the magistracy. Far be it, O pious King, that we shun the magistracy or vote for its abolition, but we teach that the magistracy is necessary for the perfection of the ecclesiastical body" (IV:58 f.). Here we have the germ of the social gospel so prevalent in the Reformed Church in our day. Zwingli originally held with Luther that the kingdom of God is spiritual (VI: II, 184), but later insisted that Christ's kingdom is also external (VIII:175 f.). In the little pamphlet *On Divine and Human Righteousness* Zwingli says that there are two laws, even as there are two righteousnesses. The one pertains to the inner man, and the other to the outer man. The former no one can fulfill, hence "no one is righteous but God and he who is made righteous through grace, of which Christ is the pledge, through faith"; but according to the latter a person may be outwardly pious and righteous and yet be condemned before God. (I:435.) Zwingli insists that the "inferior law" (I:456) is a "directing and guiding of the divine Spirit. . . . Only the believers understand the law of nature, for it is known only of God, in whom no one believes except he who is drawn of God." (I:360.) Hence the heathen do not know the law of nature from their own reason "but from the illuminating Spirit of God." (I. 361.) Zwingli ascribed less moral quality to natural man than Luther did, and in this he was followed by most Reformed

theologians. Luther maintained that man could by nature of himself lead an outwardly godly life, since the natural law was written in man's heart. Zwingli, however, insisted that it is due solely to the influence of divine grace — called "common grace" by the Reformed — that man leads an outwardly godly life. Here we have a fundamental difference between Reformed and Lutheran theology, which shows itself in the relationship between Church and State. The Lutheran Church holds that it is the business of the State to preserve and uphold the natural law, but Zwingli maintained that the State must also uphold the revealed law of God. In the Second Disputation at Zurich in 1523 Zwingli declared, "My lords should prescribe no laws unless according to the divine Scriptures." (I:524.) The State should do all in its power to bring the people to the "right knowledge of God," and those are "tyrants" who will not permit the "Gospel of Christ" to be preached to the people. (I:363; cf. 731, 453.) The State should not compel individuals to accept the various articles of faith but should merely decree that the Word of God be preached, and if shepherds do not preach the Word of God faithfully, they should be removed, "yes, even slain according to the law of Moses" (I:578). Well has Seeberg, *History of Doctrines*, II:317 f., said: "The theocratic ideal which he pursued allows to neither Church nor State its proper position. On the one hand, the secular government conducts the discipline of the Church in such a way that the doctrine of the latter becomes directly the law of the State; while, on the other hand, the secular government is absolutely subject to the authority of the Scriptures, its laws and ordinances being valid only in so far as they are Scriptural. . . . The carrying out of his reformatory work embraced both a new system of doctrine and a new order of social and practical life, which must be enforced by the agency of the State. Christianity is an affair of the State, but the State is the organ of the Church." Here as elsewhere Zwingli's medievalism and humanism appears in opposition to Luther. Reformed theology is a true child of the so-called Christian Renaissance.

Saving faith is wrought in the heart of man solely by the Spirit of God. Zwingli emphatically rejected the *fides acquisita* of the Scholastics, which man can produce in himself. (III:174.) "Faith which is confidence in God no one can give except the Spirit, no external thing. . . . No one can come to Christ unless the Father draw him." (IV:55.) But such faith is always wrought without means. Zwingli distinguished between the "external calling," through the preaching of the Word, and the "internal calling," which Christ calls drawing (III:427) and in which the "Spirit rouses the ear of the elect" (IV:121). The outlines of this theory were developed by Zwingli at a very early date (cf. I:73 f., 76 ff.), and with his symbolical interpretation of the Sacraments it was but



natural that he would also regard the preaching of the Word as an external thing which is unprofitable unless the Holy Spirit illumines and draws. Writing against Valentinus Compar in 1525, he asks: "How does a person become a believer? Does the word make him believing? No, for we see that many hear of the gracious works of the Gospel and yet do not believe. . . . Faith does not come from human reason, skill, or knowledge but only from the Spirit of God illuminating and drawing." (II:1, 11.) Writing against Luther, he says that the "elect of God inwardly taught by the Spirit firmly believe" (III:498). "Faith cannot be drawn out of the words, but when faith teaches me, I understand the words." (III:517.) "Faith is not learned from the words, but God teaches it to us, and then we also find faith in the words, i. e., as we believe we also find in the word." (II:11, 9.) In *Reckoning of the Faith* he says: "A conductor or vehicle is not necessary to the Spirit, for He Himself is the virtue and the energy whereby all things are borne and has no need of being borne. . . . Everyone that is born of the Spirit [is] invisibly and imperceptibly drawn." (IV:10.) When Paul says that faith cometh by hearing, then he ascribes faith to a "cause which is of the Spirit alone and not of the external preaching as the Sacramentarians [Lutherans] contend. . . . The opinion of the Apostle is that the word is to be preached whereby God, who alone gives the increase, as through His instrument plants faith, but with His near and own hand. For the work of the Apostle comes from the hand of God, but only as a means; the inner drawing, however, is the immediate working of the Spirit" (IV:125). Zwingli also distinguished between the external and the internal word. The former is the preaching of the Gospel, the latter is faith itself, "the believing in the heart and the understanding of the mind." That we believe in Christ is neither the effect of the external nor of the internal word but of the Father who draws us. (III:472 f.) Here we have a doctrine akin to the spiritualism of the Anabaptists, though Zwingli was hardly influenced by them. We would rather trace it to his Humanistic background or more specifically to the Platonism which he had imbibed through his Humanistic studies. (Cf. Ritschl, *op. cit.*, III:57.)

In his "Explanation" of the Eighteenth Article, Zwingli says that a "Sacrament properly signifies an oath." Sacraments are those things which "God has set up, promised, and ordained in His Word so firmly as though He had set it down with an oath" (I:238). Hence the Sacraments are nothing more than a "sure sign and seal" (I:239) and a "certain pledge and seal" (I:245). But in his *Commentary on True and False Religion* Zwingli says that the Sacrament is nothing more than a "dedication and consecration,"

a "public setting apart" (III:229). He gives as his opinion that the "Sacraments are signs and ceremonies by which man proves to the Church that he is a candidate or a soldier of Christ, and makes the whole Church more certain of your faith than you are" (III:231). He says that we dare not attribute to the symbols the things which "are solely of the divine power and the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit in our souls" (IV:119). In *Reckoning of the Faith* he writes: "I believe, yes, I know, that all the Sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not even convey or distribute it. In this matter, most powerful Caesar, I may seem to thee perhaps too bold. But my opinion is fixed. For as grace is produced or given by the Divine Spirit (for when I use the term 'grace,' I am speaking the Latin for pardon, i. e., indulgence and gratuitous kindness), so this gift pertains to the Spirit alone." Then follows the passage quoted above, that the Spirit needs no conductor or vehicle. "The Sacraments are given as a public testimony of that grace which is previously present to every individual." (IV:9f.)

Regarding Baptism, Zwingli says in the "Explanation" of the Eighteenth Article that "dipping does not wash away sins unless the baptized [person] believes the salvation of the Gospel, i. e., the gracious redemption of Christ" (I:252; cf. VII:298). Again he says, "We come to Christ through faith without a medium." (I:412.) Soon after the Second Disputation in 1523 he came into conflict with the Baptists, or Anabaptists, who denied infant baptism (the primitive Baptists were not interested in the question of immersion or sprinkling) and carried out his ideas to their logical conclusion. Since Zwingli regarded Baptism merely as something external which does not wash away sins, and since he maintained that we come to Christ through faith without a medium, therefore the Baptists drew the logical conclusion that infant baptism was useless. Formerly Zwingli had himself questioned the propriety of infant baptism (II:1, 245; VII, 365); hence it cannot be denied that the Baptists were the spiritual children of Zwingli even though he disowned them (cf. Baur, *op. cit.*, II:56 f., 803 ff.), for if Baptism is not a means of grace, then there is no benefit in infant baptism, and as a mere external ceremony it might as well be discarded. Now, in order to refute the logical conclusions of his own teachings, Zwingli had to revise his teaching somewhat. He continued to deny that Baptism washes away sins and maintained that the Holy Spirit immediately effects faith, but in his book *Baptism, Rebaptism, and Infant Baptism*, which appeared in May, 1525, he insisted that Baptism was a sign of allegiance. Zwingli summarized his view at the end of the book in these sentences: "Of Baptism in General. No element or outward thing in this world can cleanse the soul, but the purification of the soul is by divine grace. Hence it follows

that Baptism cannot wash away sin. Since it cannot wash away [sin], yet has been instituted by God, it must always be to the people of God a sign of allegiance and nothing else. II. Of Infant Baptism. Even as in the Old Testament, so the children of Christians are, like their parents, the children of God; since they are of God, who will hinder their water-baptism? To the ancients circumcision was for a sign, even as Baptism is to us [a sign]; and as it [circumcision] was given to children, so likewise Baptism should be given to children. III. Of Rebaptism. Rebaptism is neither taught nor exemplified nor confirmed from the Word of God; hence those who rebaptize themselves crucify Christ anew either because of egotism or to present something new." (II:1, 301.)

As to the salvation of unbaptized infants Zwingli held that original sin does not damn the children of Christians. If children die in infancy, it is a sign that they were the elect of God, for in the case of infants, faith or unfaith does not exclude from election. "It is my opinion that all infants who are under the testament are doubtless of the elect by the laws of the testament." (III:428.) "If Esau had died an infant, he would doubtless have been of the elect. . . . But he could not die whom divine providence had created that he might live, and live wickedly." (III:429.) Zwingli's doctrine of Baptism can only be understood in the light of his doctrine of election, for he himself says that, if his inquirers would read his book *De providentia Dei*, they would have reached the harbor long ago. (III:572.)

### III

In 1521 Oecolampadius of Basel, the friend of Zwingli, declared in a sermon on the Sacrament of the Eucharist: "I do not pronounce it a mere figure, such as was the paschal lamb. Far from us be the blasphemy of attributing to the shadow as much as to the light and truth; and to those figures, as much as to the most sacred mystery. For this bread is not merely a sign, but is the very body of the Lord itself. We simply confess, therefore, that the flesh and blood of Christ are present and contained; but in what manner we do not seek to discover, nor is it necessary nor useful that we should. . . . In what mode He who sits above the heavens, at the right hand of the Father, is truly present on the altars, inasmuch as it is a thing which it is impossible for us to know, is a matter which should not disturb us. What wonder is it since we know not in what mode Christ, after His resurrection, came into the presence of His disciples while the doors were closed? . . . What is that thing of inestimable price which is hidden within this covering? It is the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that body which was born, suffered, and died for us, and was afterwards glorified in the triumph of the resur-

rection and ascension." (Quoted in Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology*, p. 756.) Already in 1520 Luther had stated his views in his *Sermon on the New Testament* (St. Louis ed., XIX:1037 ff.) and in his *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (St. Louis XIX:1 ff.). Luther rejected transubstantiation but taught a real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament and emphatically stated that "the sixth chapter of John does not with a single syllable speak of the Sacrament" (XIX:14). Zwingli was acquainted with some of Luther's works;<sup>3)</sup> yet he secretly disagreed on the Lord's Supper. In his *Sixty-seven Articles* he wrote in the Eighteenth Article: "The Mass is not a sacrifice, but is a remembrance of the sacrifice and assurance of the salvation which Christ has given us" (I:154); and in his *Exposition and Proof of the Conclusions or Articles*, published immediately after the Zurich debate in 1523, he compared his own teaching with that of Luther and found no difference between the two, even though he himself called the Lord's Supper a "remembrance," while Luther called it a "testament." (I:249.) Zwingli wrote his *Exposition* against the Romish doctrine and says that the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice but a remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ and a "guarantee to the weak that Christ has redeemed them, so that they are certain of it if they firmly believe that Christ paid their sin on the cross and in such faith eat and drink His flesh and blood. . . . To them their sins are forgiven." He expressly states that there is "no contention" whether or not Christ's body and blood are eaten and drunk, "for no Christian doubts this" (I:242). But in opposition to Luther, who maintained that John 6 did not with a single syllable refer to the Lord's Supper, Zwingli found his interpretation of the Lord's Supper in those words and claimed: "The body and blood of Christ is nothing else than the word of faith, namely, that His body was slain for us and His blood was shed for us, has redeemed and reconciled us to God. If we firmly believe this, then our soul is nourished and refreshed with the body and blood of Christ. Nevertheless, Christ has, in order that the testament itself may be comprehensible to the simple-minded, given to His body an edible form, the bread, and to His blood the drinking vessel, or drink, so that they are strengthened in the faith by

3) Cf. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, p. 139 ff., where Jackson quotes from the correspondence of Zwingli in 1519. Later, when Zwingli became exceedingly jealous of Luther's fame, he tried to tell everyone that he had discovered the Gospel long before he even heard of Luther and that he purposely refrained from reading Luther's works. In the latter half of 1520 there appeared an anonymous Latin pamphlet with an appendix entitled "A Defense of Martin Luther by Christ our Lord, addressed to the City of Rome." (III:1-6.) That Zwingli had a hand in its composition is proved by the fact that a draft in Zwingli's own handwriting has been preserved to this day. (Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 155.)

a visible transaction." (I:252; cf. letter to Wyttenach, VII:297 ff.) Baur, *op. cit.*, II:277, has well said: "The celebration of the Lord's Supper as something external with external elements can only be symbolical, as is clear from the words of Zwingli, even though the exegetical proof from the words of institution is still lacking." Zwingli therefore believed in a symbolical interpretation of the Lord's Supper long before he had a Scriptural "proof" for his theory. Melancthon (*Corpus Reform.*, IV:970) expressly states that Zwingli confessed to him at Marburg that Erasmus had first suggested this theory to him. Previous to this time Rode, the Rector of the Brethren School at Utrecht, had brought to Luther some of the writings of Wessel Gansfort and a treatise of Cornelius Hoen (Honijs) in which Hoen treated the Lord's Supper as a spiritual eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood and maintained "is must be taken for signifies." Wessel Gansfort, the greatest theologian of the Brethren of the Common Life, had distinguished between a sacramental and a spiritual eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood and had emphasized the latter, and it was but natural that one of his followers would develop his thoughts further. This was done by Hoen, who wrote: "Christ has instituted the Holy Supper in order that the soul may firmly believe that she really has a Bridegroom of her own, who gave Himself for her and shed for her His precious blood. By this means she is induced to avert her affections from the objects she formerly loved, to fix them on Christ alone, and to make Him her chief good. This means, as the Savior says John 6, to feed upon Christ and to drink His blood; and whoever partakes of the Lord's Supper without such faith feeds rather upon the manna of the Jews than upon Christ. . . . Paul does not say: The bread is the body of Christ. It is rather evident that in this passage is must be taken for signifies, which may be clearly inferred from the comparison between the bread and the sacrifices to idols." (Quoted in Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, Eng. trans., II:519 ff.) Luther approved of the writings of Wessel but emphatically rejected Hoen's treatise, and therefore Rode went to Oecolampadius and later, with Saganus, visited Zwingli, who published Hoen's treatise in 1525. Zwingli says: "I saw that the words 'This is My body' are figurative, but I did not see in what word the figure lay. At this point, by the grace of God, it happened that two learned and pious men came to consult on this matter; and when they heard our opinion (for they had concealed their own, for it was not then safe to express opinions on the subject freely), they thanked God, and gave me an untied package, the letter of a learned and pious Hollander [Hoen]. In it I found this precious pearl that is here means signifies. When we were compelled to explain our opinions openly, it seemed more discreet to open with that key the word in which the figure lies



than simply to say: 'It is a figure.'" (III:606; cf. II:11, 61 f.) Zwingli knew of Hoen's treatise already in 1521 (cf. Baur, *op. cit.*, II:280, footnote); but why did he not bring this exegetical "proof," this "precious pearl" which he had found in Hoen, in his *Exposition* of 1523? The answer is found in his attitude towards Luther. Baur, *op. cit.*, II:283, would have it that Zwingli was so eager to preserve peace between the Wittenberg and Zurich theologians. That can hardly be true. Rather, as Ritschl, *op. cit.*, III:88, says, Zwingli showed himself as a cautious and astute politician in carrying out his reformatory plans, and therefore he held back for a long time with the propaganda for his Lord's Supper doctrine. Zwingli claimed: "I began to preach the Gospel of Christ in the year 1516, before anyone in my locality had so much as heard the name of Luther; for I never left the pulpit without taking the words of the Gospel as used in the Mass service of the day and expounding them by means of the Scriptures." (I:253.)<sup>4)</sup> He ex-

4) But, as Ritschl, *op. cit.*, III:30 f., points out, in 1516 Zwingli, as the admirer of Erasmus, did not understand by the Gospel anything else than what Erasmus meant thereby, namely, a practical Christianity based on the Sermon on the Mount. Baur, *op. cit.*, II:784 ff., says, while referring to Erasmus and Beatus Rhenanus, who both regarded Christianity as a philosophy, that by thus grouping Christianity with the philosophical systems of the Graeco-Roman world, the Humanists showed that they valued Christianity not so much because of the idea of redemption (though naturally that thought also appeared in their writings) but mainly because of its practical suggestions as to a pious life after the example of Christ; in short, the Humanistic viewpoint concerned itself not so much with religion but rather with a religiously colored Christian morality. In a letter dated Dec. 6, 1518 (VII:57 ff.), Rhenanus describes Zwingli's preaching in these words: "You and those like you bring forth to the people the pure philosophy of Christ, straight from the fountain, uncorrupted by interpretation of Scotist or Gabrielist, but expounded by Augustine, Ambrose, Cyprian, Jerome faithfully and correctly. But those people standing in a position where whatever is said the people at large think is true, bleat out nonsense about the power of the Pope, remission, purgatory, counterfeit miracles by the saints, restitution contracts, vows, pains of the damned, Antichrist. But you, in preaching to your congregation, show the whole doctrine of Christ briefly displayed as in a picture: how Christ was sent down to the earth by God to teach us the will of the Father, to show us that this world, i.e., riches, honor, authority, pleasures, and all that kind of thing, are to be contemned so that the heavenly country can be sought with the whole heart; to teach us peace and concord and the attractive community of all possession (for Christianity is nothing else) even as Plato dreamed of in his Republic, for he is to be numbered among the great prophets; to take away from us foolish affections of earthly affairs concerning country, parents, relatives, health, and other possessions; to declare that poverty and disadvantages in this life are not real evils." If this is a correct description of Zwingli's preaching of that time, his preaching was indeed altogether different from that of the monks; but his gospel was a half mystical-ascetic and half rationalistic-Pelagian Christianity, certainly not the true Gospel of Christ. Zwingli at this time opposed the peddling of indulgences and at the same time pleaded with the Bishop of Constance and the papal legate to remove the gross abuses and superstitions from the Church, but in all this Zwingli was merely repeating what hundreds had said before him.

pressly maintained that he had purposely not read much of Luther's writings so as to give the Papists no cause to accuse him. (I:255.) Zwingli objected to being called a "Lutheran" and even warned his readers against praising Luther too highly. "Therefore let us, pious Christians, not change the honored name of Christ into the name of Luther. For Luther did not die for us, but teaches us to know Him from whom alone we have all salvation. . . . If Luther preaches Christ, he does the same as I do." (I:256.) "Zwingli was jealous of Luther because he was so much more famous." (Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 279.)

Luther had meanwhile become involved in a controversy with Carlstadt, who denied the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, maintaining that Christ at the institution of the Supper with the words "Take, eat" referred to the bread, and then pointed to himself with the words "This is My body." When two pastors of Reutlingen, Matthew Alber, who adhered to the Lutheran view, and Conrad Hermann, who approved of Carlstadt's explanation, wanted to debate publicly on the question, Zwingli advised against it in a letter to Alber on November 16, 1524. In this letter Zwingli admitted that in John 6 Christ does not treat of "this Sacrament," but nevertheless stated that the passage serves to refute the false conceptions concerning this Sacrament. Zwingli regarded John 6 as "the most fortified and strongest battleground" since Christ there draws away from the "sensible things to the internal and spiritual" (III:593). When Christ speaks of eating His flesh, He speaks "of faith, not of the Sacrament of the Eucharist" (III:595), and yet Zwingli says: "This word (John 6:63) is an obstacle which excludes all efforts of those who speak of an essential body of Christ"; for when Christ says that he who eats and drinks His flesh and blood has eternal life, He does not mean "that which is liquid or that which has weight, but that which we recognize in our mind as the pledge of our salvation because it has been slain for us on the cross. These words, I say, believed by us and sunk into the inward parts of our heart acquire eternal life, for by faith alone are we justified." (Note the reason for the emphasis on faith alone.) "Faith therefore which is certain that the crucified Christ is our redemption and salvation is itself those words which Christ has spoken, which are spirit and life." (III:596.) Zwingli then took up the words of institution. He lauded Carlstadt for his emphasis on faith and because he recognized that the words of institution must be understood in another sense, but he rejected his interpretation in order that he might put forward his own, that it must be understood as *signifies*. (III:597 ff.) As Baur, *op. cit.*, I:485, shows, Zwingli was not opposed to Carlstadt's doctrine as such, but to his manner of interpreting the words

of institution. Zwingli insisted that "eating the Eucharist does not remove sin, but is a symbol for those who firmly believe and give thanks that through the death of Christ their sins have been exhausted and deleted" (III:602). Then, warning against the propensity of some who are ready to swear an oath on the words of their master (referring to Luther), he adjured Alber "by Jesus Christ, the Judge of the quick and the dead, not to show this letter to anyone of whom he did not certainly know that he was sincere in the faith" (III:603). Why this secrecy? Was this the way in which a shrewd politician was making propaganda for his symbolic doctrine? Copies of the letter soon circulated in Southern Germany, and Zwingli himself helped to disseminate it by sending copies to his friends Bucer and Capito in Strassburg and to Oecolampadius in Basel. In January, 1525, Luther published his *Wider die himmlischen Propheten*, directed mainly against Carlstadt, but also directed against all those who held the symbolic view of the Lord's Supper. Zwingli now put aside his "peculiar secretive conduct" (Ritschl) and in March of that year published his letter to Alber and at the same time issued his *Commentary on True and False Religion*, which contained a lengthy statement in which he insisted that it was the equivalent of *signifies*. "This signifies My body. . . . This thing, to wit, which I offer you to eat, is the symbol of My body. . . . This which I now command you to eat and drink shall be to you a symbol. . . . As often as ye eat this symbolic bread." (III:257 ff.) Zwingli expressly says that in his previous treatment of this matter in the *Sixty-seven Articles* he had written for the times rather than to declare the whole truth "that he might not cast pearls before swine." (III:238 f.) The *Commentary* (the part on the Lord's Supper was later separately issued in a German translation) was directed chiefly against the Roman Catholic doctrine, and Luther's name was not even mentioned; but Luther could not fail to see that he was included in the condemnation of those who maintained that there was a corporeal presence in the Supper. Meanwhile on Tuesday of Holy Week in 1525 Zwingli and his colleagues appeared before the Zurich Council with the request that at the coming Easter Festival the Lord's Supper should be celebrated according to its original institution. Zwingli, who was opposed by the town clerk Am Gruet, insisted that the words "This is My body" must be understood as "This signifies My body" and quoted such passages as "The seed is the Word"; "I am the Vine"; "The rock was Christ." But Am Gruet replied that these passages were all taken from parables and therefore proved nothing. That evening, before going to bed, Zwingli tried hard to find a Bible passage which would prove beyond a doubt that it has the sense of *signifies*. He looked in vain. Later that night he had a dream,

and four days later he published his *Crown of the Eucharist*, where we read the following story. Zwingli writes: "I am about to narrate a fact—a fact of such a kind that I would wish to conceal it, but conscience compels me to pour forth what the Lord has imparted, though I know to what reproach and ridicule I am about to expose myself. On the thirteenth of April I seemed to myself, in a dream, to contend with an adversary, a writer, and to have lost my power of speech, so that what I knew to be true my tongue failed me in the effort to speak. . . . Though, as concerns ourselves, it be no more than a dream, thanks be to God, to whose glory also we are telling these things. We seemed to be greatly disturbed. At this point, from a machine" (the theatrical apparatus by which supernatural persons were made to appear in the air) "an adviser was present (whether he was black or white I do not at all remember; for it is a dream I am telling), who said: You weakling! answer him that in Ex. 12:11 it is written: 'It is the Phase [cf. Vulgate], that is, the passing over, of the Lord.' On the instant that this apparition showed itself, I sprung from my couch. I first examined the passage thoroughly in the Septuagint, and preached upon it before the whole congregation with all my strength. This sermon dispelled the doubts of the students who had hesitated because of the obstacle of the parable. Such a Passover of Christ was celebrated on those three days as I never saw, and the number of those, it is thought, who look back to the garlic and fleshpots of Egypt is going to be far less." (III:341; cf. Krauth, *op. cit.*, p. 616 ff., where this interpretation is proved untenable; also Pieper, *op. cit.*, III:391.)

In the fall of 1525 Luther wrote that he intended to let others answer Zwingli and Oecolampadius (De Wette, 3:32 f.), but soon he recognized that he could not remain silent in the long run because of the clamor of the Zwinglians (3:43), though as yet he did not have time (3:87). Zwingli's *Commentary* was answered by John Bugenhagen, and in October of that same year Zwingli wrote his *Responsio* (III:604–614), where he insisted that the words of institution must be interpreted in the light of the words: "The flesh profiteth nothing." In this connection he says that he was always filled with disgust when he read the title "Doctor or Professor of Theology" written in books of men who "perhaps" are theologians. (III:609.) This was directed against Luther, for Bugenhagen did not receive his doctorate until 1533. Again he says: "Your opinion or conclusion when you declare: 'That you call us Christ devourers and flesh eaters is blasphemy,' I hear gladly. I acknowledge that it is a little blasphemous that I have called those flesh eaters who certainly do not eat flesh where they think." (III:610.) We must remember that the Zwinglians called

all believers in the Real Presence new Papists, Capernaïtes, flesh devourers, anthropophagi, blood drinkers, stupid men who worship a baked god, and pronounced the doctrine itself impious, foolish, inhuman, and an absurd superstition long before Luther wrote a single word against the Zwinglians. Shortly before this, Oecolampadius had attacked the Real Presence in his tract entitled *De genuina verborum Domini expositione liber*, which he dedicated to the brethren in Swabia with the plain intention of winning them away from Luther to Zwingli, and in February the following year (1526) Zwingli tried to popularize his teaching in the German treatise *Ein klare Unterrichtung vom Nachtmal Christi* (II:1, 427—468). Most astonishing is that Zwingli at the end of this treatise said that he did not want to get mixed up with the very learned Martin Luther (II:1, 467). The Zwinglians meanwhile carried on a well-planned and vigorous propaganda to undermine Luther's authority and to win friends for their symbolic views. In this they were encouraged by Bucer of Strassburg, who at first agreed with Luther, but was later won over to the symbolic view through the efforts of Rode and the treatise of Hoen. At first Bucer tried to make peace between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, but he was only interested in a peace with a Zwinglian victory, or, as Eells, *Martin Bucer*, p. 76, puts it, he desired a "Zwinglian victory attained by peaceful means." But Bucer only added fuel to the flames. In his translation of Bugenhagen's *Commentary on the Psalms* he substituted in some places his own Zwinglian perversions for the original. For this he was condemned with hard words by the Lutherans. Somewhat later, on July 27, 1526, in publishing the fourth volume of his Latin translation of Luther's commentaries, he added what he called the true doctrine of the Supper; but everyone could easily recognize that this doctrine was altogether different from that of Luther. In a "Letter to the Christian Reader" added to the 9th chapter of First Corinthians, Bucer, while lauding Luther as an exegete, directed his readers to the work of Oecolampadius for a study of the Eucharist. Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 80, says: "Bucer had not erred again by publishing his own beliefs as those of another, but he had apparently stooped to a dishonorable use of Luther's name to gain publicity and a market for statements which he knew Luther would not approve. . . . Actually he used Luther's reputation to sell an attack upon him." Luther was furious. He acknowledged Bucer's skill as a translator but declared that "he had contaminated that gift of fecundity and intelligence, yea, lost it, in that pestilent poison of the monstrous blasphemy of the sacramentarian spirit. . . . He finished the first volumes piously and purely, but in the fourth volume he could not restrain himself from boasting and propagating



his own interpretation, and an incredible madness of a covetous spirit — first in a virulent and sacrilegious preface, then in noxious notes, he has crucified my work" (St. Louis, XVII:1580; Enders, V:384). Luther wrote this letter to Herwagen, the publisher, asking him to include it as an antidote if a second edition were printed; but somehow a rival printer, Secerius, gained a copy of the letter and immediately printed it. The letter naturally raised a storm in the camp of the Zwinglians, who clamored: "Why does Luther keep silence? Why does he not come out with his opinion?" (St. Louis, XVII:1581; De Wette, 3:202.) In the spring of 1526 Luther had written the preface to the German translation of the *Swabian Syngamma* (St. Louis, XX:576), in which he asserted that the arguments advanced in his *Wider die himmlischen Propheten* had not been refuted and that not only the *touto* of Carlstadt, but also the *significat* of Zwingli and the *figura corporis* of Oecolampadius were suggestions of the devil. (The original *Swabian Syngamma*, which had appeared late in 1525, was an answer written by Brenz and a number of Swabian clergymen to Oecolampadius' *De genuina verborum Domini expositione liber*. Oecolampadius had answered with his *Antisyngamma*.) Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 84, writes: "Aroused by the challenge, Bucer wrote to Oecolampadius on July 8, 1526, requesting that he and Zwingli should reply to Luther's *Prologum galeatum*. In order that they might not lack ammunition, he added as definite suggestions that Zwingli should admonish Luther as an erring brother not to injure the Church by strife and endeavor to rule it; that the fault in Luther's exegesis should be revealed; that the weakness of his objection to the use of reason and the patristics as authority should be disclosed." Both Zwingli and Oecolampadius were anxious to cross swords with Luther, and in a letter dated August 31, 1526, Zwingli made this slighting remark on Luther: "I think you are too solicitous in the matter of that man who is writing against me in German and Latin on the Eucharist. In nothing do I promise myself a more certain victory." (VII:538.) That month Oecolampadius published his *Billiche Antwort*, in which he combined a German translation of the *Antisyngamma* with a refutation of Luther's preface, and in February, 1527, Zwingli published his *Amica exegesis* (III:459—502), which he accompanied with an open letter to Luther. Luther pronounced it fierce. We agree with Luther. Zwingli sought to gain Luther's good will; but his friendly words were in vain, for on account of his many bitter and hateful words and the manner in which he lectured Luther like a schoolboy his writing had the opposite effect. Zwingli, as said before, was an astute politician and knew human nature, and therefore we can see in all this a well-planned campaign against Luther. Previous to this time the Zwinglians were plotting under

the pretence of peace and love, but now they came out into the open. Zwingli was a bitter enemy of the Lutherans, more so even than of the Papists. Luther's keen mind immediately saw through this plotting and hypocrisy and therefore attacked the Zwinglians with unparalleled severity. All this we must remember if we would properly evaluate the language of the opponents. In March of that year Zwingli issued his *Friendly Criticism and Defense on the Sermon of the Excellent Martin Luther Preached in Wittenberg Against the Fanatics and to Defend the Reality of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament* (II:II, 1—15). Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 278, says: "This was really an attack upon Luther, and two days later he followed it up with another letter (VIII:39—41) full of insinuations and exceedingly riling, and stirred Luther up as no other attack had done, as Luther's correspondence abundantly shows." Despite their amicable titles these writings abound in coarse, contemptuous, bitter, and truly blasphemous statements. Luther (St. Louis, XXIa:936; de Wette, 3:172 f.) complained in May, 1527: "There is no offense or cruelty of which he does not accuse me, so that even the Papists, my enemies, do not wound me as these our friends do." In answer to Zwingli's *Amica exegesis* and Oecolampadius' *Antisyngramma* (Enders, *op. cit.*, V:383) Luther issued in March, 1527, his book entitled *Dass diese Worte Christi: "Das ist mein Leib" usw., noch fest stehen wider die Schwarmgeister*, and in the following year he answered Zwingli's *Friendly Defense* with his *Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl Christi*. (It is the latter book which caused Bucer to see that he was wrong in his judgment of Luther, and this book caused him to modify his own views. Cf. Eells, *op. cit.*, p. 87 ff.) In his polemics against the Zwinglians, Luther used exceedingly coarse language, but he was only giving them a taste of their own medicine. They had attacked him first, and these his seeming friends had wounded him more deeply than even the Papists. But what they resented most was that he insisted that their doctrine came from the devil himself. We can understand this expression of Luther only if we know Luther's own experience, for, as Ritschl, *op. cit.*, III:91 f. (cf. Holl, *Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I:355) points out, Luther regarded those disturbances of faith which he himself had and was experiencing as suggestions of the devil. All denials of, and all opposition to, his personal religious convictions were treated similarly; hence in the eyes of Luther those who differed from him and whose views he regarded as coming from the devil were to some extent excusable, for Satan and not they were actually responsible for such errors.

When Charles V had concluded a treaty with Pope Clement VII and solemnly pledged himself to suppress Protestantism, the Land-

grave Philip of Hesse was eager to have the Swiss included in a defensive alliance of the German Protestants against Charles V. Zwingli and the Zwinglians were anxious at least to appear as being at one with the Lutherans and thus permitted to join the Protestant alliance. But the controversy on the Lord's Supper between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians stood in the way of their admittance, and therefore a colloquy was arranged between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, especially between the Lutheran leaders Luther and Melancthon and the Swiss leaders Zwingli and Oecolampadius. The colloquy was held at Marburg on October 1—4, 1529, but it did not and could not bring about the desired union between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, for there was a different spirit in the leaders, and their theology was so radically different. When the conference was drawing to a close, Luther was requested to draw up certain articles in which both parties agreed, and thus originated the so-called Marburg Articles. (St. Louis, XVII: 1939 ff.; Zwingli, IV: 181 ff.).

The Fifteenth Article reads: "We all believe and hold with regard to the Supper of our dear Lord Jesus Christ that it ought to be celebrated in both kinds, according to the primitive institution; also, that the Mass is not a work by which one obtains pardon for another, whether dead or alive; also, that the Sacrament of the Altar is a Sacrament of the very body and blood of Jesus Christ and that the spiritual eating and drinking of this body and blood is especially necessary to every Christian. In like manner, as to the use of the Sacrament, we are agreed that, like the Word, it was given and ordained of Almighty God to excite weak consciences to faith and charity by the Holy Spirit. But although at present we are not agreed on the question whether the true body and blood of Christ are bodily present in the bread and wine, still each party shall show to the other Christian love, so far as each one's conscience may permit." These Marburg Articles were signed by both Lutherans and Zwinglians, and seemingly they agreed in all points except in one; but this was not so, as later developments proved.

When the public debate had been ended, the Zwinglians sought to have the Lutherans recognize them as brethren in the faith and the Landgrave earnestly besought both parties to be united and to regard one another as brothers. Then, as the Reformed Christoffel, *Zwingli* (Eng. trans.), p. 362, says: "Zwingli, magnanimous and noble as he always was, came forward to Luther, with tears in his eyes, saying: 'There are none in the world with whom I should more desire to be at peace than the Wittenbergians.' But the hand stretched forward in largeness of heart was pushed back by Luther with the hard words: 'You have another spirit. I am surprised that you regard me as a brother, whose doctrine you

recently stigmatized as false. You surely cannot hold much of your own doctrine.' This "narrow-minded obstinacy" of spirit gave deep offense, not only to the Swiss and the men of Strassburg, but also the Landgrave. 'Choose between the two,' said Bucer; 'either you recognize none as brother who differs from you in opinion in but a single point, and then you have not one brother on earth, no, not even in your own party, or you accept individuals who differ from you, in which case you must accept us.' Rightly Drewes in "Why Did Luther Refuse Zwingli's Hand of Brotherhood at Marburg?" (*Theol. Quart.*, 1906, Vol. X, p. 197) says: "This rejection of Zwingli's hand has received many unfavorable criticisms. The Reformed and indifferentistic writers regard it as highly discreditable to the great Reformer. With but a few exceptions, they all ascribe it to hatred, envy, want of charity, contentiousness, obstinacy, and the like ignoble motives. This harsh uncharitable censure, which is to be found in nearly every non-Lutheran history and cyclopedia, need not surprise us, however; for Luther's critics view his conduct at Marburg through glasses that are colored by partisanship or by religious indifference. They are either the spiritual children of Zwingli, or they have drunk of the intoxicating cup of indifferentism and unionism. To expect praise and approval of Luther's attitude at Marburg from such persons would be expecting a psychological miracle." Read the whole article by Drewes! The Zwinglians had begun the vicious attack on Luther, and for a while they feigned friendship with the Lutherans in order that they might be admitted to the Protestant alliance against the Papists. They were willing to sign almost anything in order to attain their end, for they were interested only in an external union, and their theology was so broad as to permit fellowship with those who did not agree with them. Luther on the other hand was interested in a Christian unity in faith and doctrine. "The Word and doctrine must effect Christian unity or fellowship; . . . where there is no agreement in doctrine, no unity will remain anyway." (St. Louis, IX:831.) Luther had refused to give Zwingli the hand of brotherhood, but, as he says, "We gave them the hand of peace and love that meanwhile the hard words and writings should rest and each teach his opinion without invective, but not without defense and refutation." (St. Louis, XVII:1955.) Zwingli on the other hand soon dried his tears and boasted: "Truth was so clearly superior that, if anyone was overcome, Luther the impudent and obstinate was beaten." (VIII:370.) A few months later, in his *Reckoning of the Faith*, he referred to the Lutherans as those "who long for the fleshpots of Egypt" (IV:11). Throughout the controversy Zwingli showed himself as a smooth, astute, and crafty politician, so different from the simplehearted but blunt and outspoken Luther.

Zwingli maintained that Luther had either never learned to know the "glorious splendor of the Gospel" or else had forgotten it. Referring to absolution, he says that the "certainty of faith comes from the Gospel, since we know that the Son of God has paid for our sin with His death. If faith is present, then absolution, or release, is present; hence there is no need of [further] assurance to man, for man must become certain solely through faith, which no one but God gives." No one can accept Christ except the Father draw him, and "as soon as he is drawn, he believes. If he believes, he is certain. But during the time that there is no certainty, there is no perfect faith; for if faith is present, certainty is also present" (II:II, 22). Man, therefore, needs no external assurance to strengthen his faith. Zwingli insisted that faith alone saves, but he believed this excludes the thought that the Sacraments justify. "If faith alone does not save without the virtue of external things, then a person goes back to works." (III:460.) "Faith is the work which saves, not the corporeal eating of the body" (III:595), and he who "believes" is "not ignorant on what ground salvation is based," and therefore needs no eating of corporeal flesh. (III:248.) To believe and to perceive are two separate things. "See what a monstrosity of speech this is: I believe that I eat sensible and corporeal flesh. If it is corporeal, then it has not the work of faith, for it is perceived. But those things which are perceived need no faith, for through the sense they are altogether certain. . . . Faith . . . draws to invisible things . . . and does not occupy itself with sensible and corporeal things and has nothing in common with them." (III:249.) Zwingli claimed that the chief error of his opponents consisted in not knowing what faith is. Faith is not merely "to think" or "to imagine" or "to suppose" but "to trust." The opponents are guilty of a fallacious argument, for "they who eat Christ, *i. e.*, who believe in Him, *i. e.*, trust in Him, have eternal life, not those who believe that the bread is His flesh, for to this opinion salvation is nowhere promised" (III:350). As we noted before, Zwingli maintained that faith is not effected through the external Word, but solely through the inward working of the Holy Spirit, who also causes the believer to accept the external Word. Thus the Sacraments also effect a "historical faith," which refreshes the memory in the things which have happened, but nothing gives trust in God but the Spirit" (IV:55).

Zwingli says that to understand the words of institution in their natural sense is "absurd" (III:517), for "if *is* is taken essentially, then we would have to eat His body with flesh, bone, veins, nerves, marrow, and the other members, which I will not mention here" (II:I, 438). "Then the substance of bread is plainly changed into the substance of flesh," and it is false to say, "Bread



remains bread," or, "Under the bread a person eats the flesh" (II:1, 432). Then the Pope is right in insisting that the bread is substantially changed into the body of Christ. (II:11, 5, 40.) Zwingli asserted that on the basis of such Scripture passages as Gen. 41: 26 f.; Ex. 12:11, 27; Matt. 11:14; 12:49; 13:19 f., 37 ff.; Luke 8: 11, 14 f.; John 8:12; 9:5; 10:7, 9; 14:6; 15:1; Gal. 4:24 is was the equivalent of *signifies*. He did not maintain that is must always be understood thus, but this interpretation was necessary in the words of institution (III:257, 336, 484, 553, 606; II:1, 457; II:11, 41, etc.), for the words of Christ, John 6:63, "The flesh profiteth nothing" and the words of the Creed "He ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God" do not permit the body of Christ to be corporeally present and corporeally eaten in the Lord's Supper. (II:1, 499.)

Zwingli rejected the idea of eating the true and corporeal body of Christ "spiritually." These two things do not go together. "Body and spirit are so different from each other that, if you accept one, it cannot be the other. . . . To eat corporeal flesh spiritually is nothing else but to maintain, What is body is spirit." (III:249; cf. III:493.) And yet he admitted an eating of Christ's body by faith. Explaining John 6, he said: "Therefore the bread, i. e., the food of the soul which I [Christ] have promised, is My flesh, but not, as you think, as it lives and dwells with you, but as it is given for the world, i. e., is atrociously slain for the dead to quicken them. . . . My flesh, therefore, inasmuch as it is afflicted with death, is food, i. e., is the hope of the mind. From this we clearly see that the flesh of Christ is in no other manner food or hope of the human mind but only in so far as it has been slain for us." (III:594.) Again he says: "The body of Christ is then eaten when His death for us is believed." (III:595.) "Christ understands in this chapter [John 6] under bread and eating nothing else but Gospel and faith, that he who believes that He has sacrificed Himself for us, and relies on it, has eternal life." (III:243.) "To eat His flesh and to trust in Him is one thing." (II:1, 443.) "To eat His flesh and drink His blood must be understood as to trust in Him, that His flesh and blood has been given for the redemption and washing away of our sins." (II:1, 438.) Zwingli says in *Reckoning of the Faith* that "the true body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith, i. e., that they who thank the Lord for the kindness conferred on us in His Son acknowledge that He assumed true flesh, in it truly suffered, truly washed away our sins in His own blood, and thus everything done by Christ becomes present to them by the contemplation of faith. But that the body of Christ in essence and really, i. e., the natural body itself, is either present in the Supper or masticated with our mouth or

teeth, as the Papists and some who long for the flesh pots of Egypt assert, we not only deny but firmly maintain is an error opposed to God's word." (IV:11.) We must remember that according to Zwingli faith "draws to invisible things" and "does not occupy itself with sensible and corporeal things and has nothing in common with them" (III:249). He could conceive of only two modes of eating and drinking Christ's body and blood: a Capernaitic, or carnal, or physical, eating and drinking and an eating or drinking by faith (faith, of course, pertaining only to invisible things). He could not conceive of a sacramental, supernatural, incomprehensible eating and drinking of the true and real body and blood of Christ.

Zwingli formerly explained the words of institution according to John 6 (I:272), but later he admitted that "in this place [John 6] Christ does not speak of the Sacrament" (II:1,438; cf. III:595). Already in his *Commentary on True and False Religion* he brought six reasons to prove that those err grievously who maintain that "Christ in this whole chapter speaks of the Sacrament." (III:241 ff.) Why, then, did he constantly refer to John 6? Zwingli says that he did this "so that they who force all Scripture, whether it will or not, to serve their own opinions cannot here find weapons to defend their error" (III:241). Since the same question of eating Christ's body is raised in the Sacrament and in John 6, why not revert to that passage where Christ with a sharp sword cut the knot so that no hope remains to bring those two things together: "body and eating"? (III:490 f.) Again he says, "How could I better answer error than with the words of Christ with which He Himself answered a similar error." (II:1,447.) Zwingli held that the words of John 6:63 forbid the assumption of a corporeal eating of the body of Christ. "The flesh of Christ profits in every way much and indeed immsensely, but . . . slain, not eaten. Slain it delivers us from death, but eaten inwardly it profits nothing." (III:246.) Hence the words of John 6:63 compel us to interpret the words of institution as "This signifies My body." (III:253.) These words are "strong enough to hinder that the words of Christ 'This is My body' may be understood of an essential, corporeal flesh; for if the flesh profiteth nothing, then Christ did not give it." (II:1,446.) The words of institution are "dark" and must therefore be explained by the "clear" words of John 6:63. (II:1,450; cf. II:11, 85 ff., 184 ff.; II:1, 480; III:484, 487 ff., 609, etc.) Note the rationalism of Zwingli. Zwingli condemned those who would force Scripture to serve their own opinion and seek in John 6 a weapon to defend their error (III:241), and yet he did the very same thing; for he took a weapon from John 6:63 to bolster his peculiar opinion that the body of Christ cannot be corporeally and essentially present in the Lord's

Supper. But note his even crasser rationalism. "Faith is the teacher" and is to be consulted as to the meaning of the words of institution. Now the words "The flesh profiteth nothing" forbid that we take the words of institution in a corporeal and proper sense, hence "according to our judgment it stands here for *signifies*. But this is not our judgment but the judgment of the eternal God inasmuch as faith comes from the invisible God and also tends to the invisible God and is throughout a thing altogether foreign to all sensibility. . . . And we say according to our judgment this word must be understood thus in this place: we speak so because of certain weak people, not as though this meaning could be overthrown by any Scripture passages. Either a person must reject "The flesh profiteth nothing" . . . which to say is impious, or that alone must be the simple meaning." (III:257.) It is Zwingli's subjectivism which is the final authority in the interpretation of the words of institution. Faith has been immediately wrought in man's heart through the Holy Spirit, and such faith "cannot be drawn out of words; but when faith teaches me, I understand the words" (III:517). "The tropes must always be apprehended by the light of faith." (III:606.) Zwingli believed. His faith, according to his own teaching, was the immediate effect of the working of the Holy Spirit, and this faith, so he asserted, taught him to understand the word is as being the equivalent of *signifies*. Here we have the origin of Schleiermacher's theory that man's religious self-consciousness is the ultimate source of Christian doctrine. Ritschl, *op. cit.*, III:93, speaks of Zwingli and Oecolampadius as *Wahrheitsfanatiker* and says that they are the representatives of all later liberal theologians. Every authority, even that of the divine Word and divine revelation, is decisive only in so far and inasmuch as it agrees with one's own honest convictions. A person should not desist from all independent judgment even over against Scripture. Hence a faith like that of Luther, which accepts as true every word of God, even if it seems contrary to one's own honest convictions, was absolutely foreign to Zwingli. Ritschl may call such people *Wahrheitsfanatiker*; we would call them just plain, ordinary rationalists.

Zwingli insisted that the body and blood of Christ could not be present in the Lord's Supper because in the Creed we confess that Christ ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God. (III:484; II:1, 448 ff., 452 ff., 499; II:11, 2, 12, 19, 61; IV:52.) But Zwingli had a twofold conception of the right hand of God. He acknowledged that the right hand of God is an expression of divine majesty, power, and omnipresence. Inasmuch as Christ is God, He, Zwingli claimed, partakes of these divine qualities (II:11, 65, 173 ff.), but according to His humanity Christ is present in

heaven locally and circumscribed (III:512, 535; II:11, 82 ff.; IV:13, 51). "The humanity of Christ is not everywhere where the right hand of God is. But Christ is everywhere where the right hand of God is, not according to both natures but solely according to the divine." (II:11, 81.) And yet Zwingli maintained that he did not thereby destroy the unity of the person of Christ. (II:11, 83 ff.; IV:12.)

In spite of the fact that Zwingli originally stated that "we Germans do not need the word Sacrament" (I:241), he continued to use the term, but in an improper sense, and he even spoke of the "sacramental body of Christ" (IV:36 ff., 58). That the Sacraments do not impart grace was to him self-evident. "I believe, yea, I know, that all the Sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not even convey or distribute it." (IV:9; cf. 36.) What, then, did Zwingli understand by the Lord's Supper? To Zwingli the Lord's Supper was merely a commemoration, or proclaiming, or a thanksgiving for the death of Christ (III:263) or a communion which showed that the partakers were members of the body of Christ, the Christian Church (III:260). Zwingli argued as follows: (1) the blood of Christ is the blood of the New Testament in so far as it was shed; (2) but the blood of Christ was not yet shed when He proffered the cup to His disciples; (3) therefore Christ did not give the blood of the New Testament to drink, and therefore "we do not today drink the blood of the New Testament itself, but the symbol of the blood of the New Testament" (III:333 f.). "The cup is the figure, or symbol, of My blood, which is the blood of the New Testament, inasmuch as it was poured out for many for the remission of sins." (III:335.) The cup is not the testament of blood but "a symbol or figure of the testament of blood." As the external sign of the Passion of Christ, "through which the covenant and testament was perfected," the Sacrament is the "symbol of that festival in which bread and wine in commemoration of the death of Christ are divided by the faithful with thanksgiving in one mind" (III:354). Zwingli interpreted the words of institution as follows: "Take and eat; that, namely, which I command you to do, will signify and recall to you my body which will now be given for you." The Lord's Supper is a "sign through which they who trust in Christ's death and blood, prove to the brethren that they have the same faith" (III:599). In 1 Cor. 10:16 the word *communion* does not refer to the corporeal blood of Christ but "to those who in that act of thanksgiving drink together. The meaning is: When we drink the cup of thanksgiving together, we who have been redeemed through His death and washed by His blood, assemble together in one body." Here Paul does not speak of the distribution of our Lord's body and blood, but he calls "the

communion of the body and blood of Christ those who together celebrate their redemption" (III:351 f.). Again he says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, *i. e.*, when we bless the cup of blessing, is not this our coming together, our communion, *i. e.*, our people, church, assembly, of the blood of Christ? For you are the communion of the blood of Christ, who drink out of the one cup; and the bread which we break is it not the communion or body, or coming together, people, church, assembly, of the body of Christ? . . . For we who partake of one bread and drink of one cup come together in one body." (III:505.) Those who partake of the Lord's Supper show that "they are one body and people, who trust in Christ, the Son of God, and give thanks for His death, in which He entered for us." Hence the Lord's Supper, and here Zwingli returns to his original idea of a Sacrament, is a "public profession" or an "oath of allegiance" (III:508). The Eucharist is an "external sign of His love and ours" (II:II, 196), and the elements are not simply bread and wine, but "signs of obligation and unity" (II:II, 29; cf. 55, 61); for those who partake of the Lord's Supper publicly testify that they believe in Christ and that they will live with each other as Christians. (II:I, 498.)

Zwingli claimed that every miracle of Christ has been perceived and transmitted by someone and that there were only visible miracles. He admitted, however, that faith, which a person cannot give to himself, is an *afflatus* of the Father and is an invisible miracle, and yet he maintained that this *afflatus* of the Father could be felt in the soul, in the heart, and in the virtues of the mind. "What God instills and inspires in our mind is not numbered among the miracles, but what happens in crass things outside of the (natural) order, that we dignify with the name miracle." Hence he claimed that nothing miraculous happened when Christ instituted the Lord's Supper. (III:494; cf. II:I, 435 f.) But if nothing miraculous occurred in the Lord's Supper, then Christ as man was restricted to the visibility and circumscription of all other men. Here we have the real reason why Zwingli denied the corporeal and real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper.

Regarding the person of Christ, Zwingli says in his *Reckoning of the Faith*: "I believe and understand that the Son assumed flesh, because He truly assumed of the immaculate and perpetual Virgin Mary the human nature, yea, the entire man, who consists of body and soul. But this in such a manner that the entire man was so assumed into the unity of the hypostasis, or person, of the Son of God, that the man did not constitute a peculiar person, but was assumed into the inseparable, indivisible, and indissoluble person of the Son of God. Moreover, although both natures, the divine and the human, have so preserved their character and property



that both are truly and naturally found in Him, yet the distinct properties and works of the natures do not separate the unity of the person; no more than, in man, soul and body constitute two persons; for as they are of most diverse nature, so they operate by diverse properties and operations. Yet man, who consists of them, is not two persons, but one. So God and man is one Christ, the Son of God from eternity, and the Son of man from the dispensation of time to eternity; one person, one Christ; perfect God and perfect man; not because one nature becomes the other or they are confused with one another, but because each remains itself; and nevertheless the united person is not separated by this property." (IV:3 f.; cf. IV:48; II:II, 166, 180, 182 f.) But Zwingli so differentiated between Christ as God and Christ as man that Luther rightly accused him of Nestorianism. Zwingli repeated the ancient formulas of the *enhypostasia* of the human nature in the divine person, but he insisted that, when Scripture sometimes attributes to one nature that which belongs to another or attributes to the entire person the attribute of one nature, this must be explained through the figure of speech mentioned before, known as *alloeosis*, or interchange, or "communication, or commutation, of attributes." He explained the *alloeosis* as an "exchange by which, when speaking of the one nature of Christ, we use the terms belonging to the other. As when Christ says, 'My flesh is meat indeed,' there the human flesh is peculiar to the human nature, nevertheless through commutation it is there taken for the divine nature" (III:525). "A person names one of the two natures and understands nevertheless only one of the two" (II:II, 68; cf. 72 f., 151 ff.), yet "each [nature] preserves its qualities perpetually." (III:525; II:II, 153, 158; VI:I, 538, 712.) "John 1:14: 'The Word was made flesh,' or God became man, must be rightly understood through interchange as follows: Since God cannot become anything, otherwise He were imperfect, therefore this word dare not be understood according to its first appearance, but must have the meaning: the man is become God; so that that which is said of the deity, that it became man, must be understood of the humanity by interchange: the man is become God." (II:II, 69.) But if that be true, then John 1:14 does not teach an incarnation of the Son of God but a deification of the Son of man. Zwingli emphatically rejected the statement of Luther "Outside of Christ there is simply neither God nor Godhead" and claimed that "God is also outside of the human nature of Christ in all creatures, and was thus, before Christ became man" (II:II, 73). In this connection he explains John 3:13 as follows: "When He says, 'even the Son of Man which is in heaven,' then 'Son of Man' is there taken for the divine nature in Him; for at that time He was not corporeally in heaven according

to the human nature. But when He said, 'Even so the Son of Man must be lifted up,' then 'Son of Man' is only taken for the human nature." (II:II, 74.) "The humanity of Christ is not everywhere, where the right hand of God is. But Christ is everywhere where the right hand of God is, but not according to both natures, but only according to the divine." (II:II, 81.) The humanity of Christ is "finite and circumscribed at the right hand of God; although the right hand of God is by no means circumscribed and encircled" (II:II, 82). Hence "the humanity of Christ is not everywhere where the Godhead is." (II:II, 83; cf. II:II, 151 ff.) All that Christ experienced in this world belonged solely to the human nature and can be ascribed to the divine nature only by interchange. (IV:4.) Thus Christ suffered and died only according to His humanity, for this was impossible to His divine nature. (III:525; II:II, 163 ff.) Since faith pertains only to invisible things, Zwingli would trust in Christ only inasmuch as He was true God. His humanity was merely a pledge of grace, which was given into death to satisfy divine justice. (II:II, 7.) As God, not as man, Christ is the life of the world, the life of the soul, and nourishment unto eternal life. (VI:I, 712; cf. III:497 f.) Here we have the great difference between Zwingli and Luther and between Reformed and Lutheran theology. Luther regarded the act of redemption as an act of the indivisible theanthropic person of Christ. As the Council of Chalcedon, which rejected Nestorianism, declared: "Each form does the acts which belong to it in communion with the other." (Cf. Dierks, "Rejection of Eutychianism and Nestorianism in the *Genus Apotelesmaticum* and a Short Review of Reformed Christology, in *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, 1932, Vol. III, p. 653 ff.) Zwingli did not comprehend the fundamental thought in Luther's theology that even the human words and works of Christ are a revelation and an action of God Himself, of course, through the human nature. It is God Himself who redeemed us, for if only the human nature of Christ died for mankind, then Christ was indeed a poor Savior, who needed a Savior Himself. However, if God Himself died, then the death of Christ was of inestimable worth. Since the Son of God suffered and died as man's substitute, therefore His death became a preponderating equivalent for all the sins of mankind. The penal suffering which all men deserved was fully paid and perfectly balanced by the suffering and death of the Son of God.

Thank God, Luther did not give to Zwingli the hand of fellowship at Marburg! Had he done so, he would have denied important divine truths.

Morrison, III.

THEO. DIERKS

---

## Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

### Pentecost Sunday

**Ezek. 36:22-27**

Pentecost is the festival of God the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Holiness, who is Himself the Holy God and who manifests God's holiness through the work of sanctification. Catechism, Qu. 173.

### God Manifesting His Holiness Within His Holy Christian Church

1. *By gathering it out of all countries*
2. *By cleansing it from all filthiness*
3. *By giving to it a new heart and a new spirit*

#### 1

In this world of sin God wanted a holy people. Therefore he chose Israel, Ex. 19:3-6; cp. Deut. 7:6-8; 9:4-6. Israel had profaned God's name by defiling the Holy Land, Ez. 36:17-19; and by causing the heathen to blaspheme, v. 20. In order to manifest that He is still the Holy God, v. 21, He gives this remarkable promise: vv. 22-24. The fulfillment began under Zerubbabel, Ezra 1:1 to 2:2; continued under Ezra, eighty years later, Ezra 7:1-7; 8:1-15; on Pentecost, Acts 2, particularly vv. 5, 8-11; and will go on to the end of days, Mark 13:10; Rev. 14:6.

Into this Church we have been gathered. Are we grateful? Do we realize that this is not our doing, but a manifestation of God's holiness? Rom. 2:4.

#### 2

Text, v. 25. On sprinkling clean water cp. Num. 19:11-22. That was symbolical of the blood of Jesus, 1 John 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:2, 18, 19; Heb. 9:13, 14, 22; 12:28. This blood is applied to us by the means of grace, through which the Holy Spirit operates: the Gospel, John 4:14; 7:37-39; 1 Pet. 1:23; Baptism, Heb. 10:22; Titus 3:5-7; 1 Pet. 3:20, 21; the Lord's Supper, Matt. 26:26-28; 1 Cor. 10:16, 17.

This clean water cleanses us from all filthiness, all defilement, no matter what its nature; from all idols, all that we substitute for the true God, all lack of fear and love and trust in God, which lack is the root of all sin. We are cleansed from all sin, and cleansed thoroughly, Eph. 5:25-27; Jer. 31:34 c; Micah 7:18-20.

Are we grateful? Do we regard sin as something horrible, as an abomination, of which only God's own blood could cleanse us? Acts 20:28. Let us exclaim: Ps. 103:1-4.

3

Text, vv. 26, 27. A complete change is effected by the God of holiness, manifesting His holiness as expressed Lev. 11:44, by enabling sinners to fight against sin and begin to lead a life of holiness. A new spirit dwells in them; their heart, the seat of life, is renewed, is no longer a heart of stone. The desires, thoughts, words, actions, flowing forth from this new heart are no longer dead works, but a living service of holy people rendered in gratitude to the holy God, who has manifested in them also His holiness by sanctifying them.

This God will do. Will you as a renewed person, a holy child of God, make use of your divinely created power? Are you, in the strength of the Holy Spirit within you, walking in God's statutes? Let our daily prayer be: Ps. 51:10-13; 139:23, 24.

TH. LAETSCH

**Pentecost Monday**

Ps. 80:14-19

As God alone gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies His Church, so He alone can and will keep it in true faith until the end.

**God Is the Refuge and Strength of His Church**

1. *He alone can protect it against its enemies*
2. *He alone can keep it loyal to its Lord and God*

1

V. 16 a; cp. vv. 12, 13. So the Christian Church is harassed by enemies within and without her walls. Picture the enemies outside of the pale of Christianity. They must and will perish at the rebuke of God's countenance. As the Lord commands the waves, Job 38:11; Is. 5:22, so He will hold in check the enemies of His Church, 2 Kings 11:1-22; 20:32-37; Matt. 2:20; Acts 12:1, 2, 23. History furnishes many other examples.

Great as is the danger from without, still greater danger threatens the very existence of the Church from within. It is not only the boar out of the wood and the wild beast of the field that devour the vineyard of God; there is the cutworm of self-satisfaction that cuts down many a plant; the blight of indifference that kills many a branch still outwardly connected with the vine; the aphid of worldliness that stops the development of many a promising bud. As the vine is helpless against the enemies, so we must turn to the divine Gardener and implore His help, vv. 14, 15. He who alone could plant the vine, who alone has supplied strength in the past, He alone can preserve His Church in the manifold attacks endangering her life. To Him let us turn and ask for His protection.

## 2

Three times the thought is expressed that God alone can keep His Church loyal.

A. The Church promises, We will not go back from Thee, v. 18 a. That is the Church's vow and hope. And the basis? V. 17. We, the sons of man, of sinful Adam, born with a nature that can only stray away from God (cp. Ps. 78:57; 51:7; Job 14:4), can become men, strong men, men of His right hand, when God lets His hand be upon us and sets us at His right hand. There sits His Son, our High Priest. United with Him by our God we are strong, strong for Him, and Him alone, loyal to Him in good and evil days. Phil. 4:12, 13.

B. We will call upon His name, v. 18, place our whole trust in Him alone, follow Him whithersoever He leadeth, let no distress or anguish separate us from Him. How is that possible? Quicken us, we pray. Give us life, thou Fountain of life, through Jesus Christ, the Prince of Life! Then, and then alone, we shall live unto Thee and die unto Thee, to be forever Thine.

C. Therefore we can look fearlessly into the future with its uncertainties and perplexities and dangers. We shall be saved! V. 19 b. Why? See v. 19 a. It is God, the God of the shining face, of grace and mercy, the Lord who made His covenant with us, the God of hosts, the omnipotent Ruler; He will fulfill the promise in John 10:27-30; 11:25, 26, so that we may rejoice, Rom. 8:38, 39.

TH. LAETSCH

### Trinity Sunday

Num. 6:22-27

This threefold blessing was spoken in the Old Testament times by the Triune God, as its New Testament counterpart, 2 Cor. 13:14, proves. It sums up all the blessings which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have in the past graciously bestowed upon us and which they promise to continue. Let us meditate upon

#### **The Blessing Bestowed upon the Church by the Triune God**

We shall consider

1. *Its marvelous content*
2. *Its wonderful effect*

## 1

V. 24 speaks chiefly, though not exclusively, of the love of God, the Creator, who through our Savior has become our Father, in a higher sense than Mal. 2:10, our reconciled Father, showering down upon us innumerable blessings, material and spiritual, temporal and eternal gifts. We think here particularly of the



blessings enumerated in Luther's exposition of the First Article. In spite of the world-wide war, how kind has God been to the citizens of our country. Compare the conditions prevailing here with those of other countries, and we shall have to confess that God in a truly marvelous manner has blessed and kept, and is still blessing and keeping, us and our country.

What moves God to bless and keep us? Is it because of our greater wisdom, our unlimited resources, our righteousness? What God says to Israel in Deut. 7:7, 8; 9:6, 7 applies to us also. Not our power and righteousness have merited our blessings. They are gifts of God who has according to His promise, v. 25, made His face to shine upon us and was gracious to us. This grace has been procured by Jesus Christ and involves all the benefits in Luther's exposition of the Second Article. Show the magnitude of this gracious gift.

V. 26. Not only has the Father sent His Son to make possible our redemption and His gracious blessings. It is the Father and the Son who together with the Spirit make this salvation our own by lifting up His countenance upon us and giving us peace through bringing us to faith in the Savior and thereby filling our hearts with joy and peace and hope of everlasting life and bliss. See the exposition of the Third Article.

Truly marvelous gifts are vouchsafed to His Church by the Triune God in this wonderful blessing.

## 2

V. 27. Like Israel we need the blessing and grace and peace of the Triune God. This blessing was first spoken when Israel was in the wilderness, a sinful people, Ex. 19:12, whose wrongdoing had brought them close to destruction, Ex. 32:1-10; who had been harassed by enemies, 17:8 ff.; by hunger and thirst, 15:22-24; 16:1-3; 17:1-3. A long and wearisome journey lay before them. Sin continued to contaminate every action; sorrow and tribulation were their daily companions; death ruthlessly severed the most tender bonds of kinship and affection. Apply this to the conditions of our day.

To this people, harassed by sin and guilt, by fightings and fears within and without, the Lord twice every day proclaimed His blessing and laid His name upon them, v. 27. The priests speaking this blessing did not only *wish* upon the people God's blessing, but God indeed and in truth blessed them, gave them His protection, His grace, His peace. That is what we also need, and that is what God offers to each one upon whom this blessing is pronounced by the royal priesthood of the New Testament, 1 Pet. 2:9, be that pastor or layman. More than that. As He has adopted

us and called us by His name in Holy Baptism, Gal. 3:26, 27, so, as often as this blessing is spoken, He again opens His heart and hand and sheds upon us abundant grace and peace and blessing for body and soul. No matter what may happen, no matter how fierce the trials, how wearisome the journey, how dark the path, of our life may become, let us never forget this blessing. Let us as blessed children of grace and peace show our gratitude in holiness of life, in submission to His will, in trust in His never-failing goodness and mercy.

TH. LAETSCH

### First Sunday after Trinity

Prov. 11:23-31

The chief thought of our text, as to the principles involved, is given in the opening verse. That is the rule of life for the righteous, to desire only that which is good. Since they are living in fellowship of faith with their heavenly Father through Christ, they are ready to regulate their whole life by the wishes of the Lord, lest by their own fault they come under the condemnation of the wicked and their expectation be wrath. Our text presents in particular one phase in the conduct of men in the sight of God, namely,

#### The Use of Earthly Gifts and Blessings

1. *The improper use of such blessings*
2. *The right and proper use of such blessings*

#### 1

a. Money and material blessings. The sin of avarice is pictured in v. 24 b: withholding gifts and monetary assistance, although the situation evidently calls for such help. The judgment of the Lord upon such a person is frequently that of reducing the miser to poverty. — Speculation in the effort to increase riches quickly, at the expense of others, is condemned in v. 26 a: withholding corn, or grain, in order to drive the price up beyond fair returns on the investment. In this case the people who are thereby directly harmed, will curse the speculator, and God evidently concurs in such condemnation. — Making riches the basis of one's confidence in life is spoken of in v. 28 a: people who trust in their riches, who commit fine idolatry with respect to their money and securities. Such foolish people shall fall and come to naught. Job 31:24; 1 Tim. 6:17.

b. Talents and other qualifications. Some people employ their abilities for only one purpose, namely, to work mischief, v. 27 b. They are determined to gain honor for themselves and do not

hesitate to trample on the rights of others. They prove themselves unworthy of the gifts of God.—The situation is aggravated if a person troubles his own house, does not even possess enough natural affection for his own flesh and blood to give them the proper care. 1 Tim. 5:8. Such people, as it were, sow the wind and will reap the whirlwind, and frequently fools of this type will become the servants of those who use their good common sense and act in keeping with the will of God. V. 29.

2

a. Blessings in the form of money and earthly goods. The advantage of the right kind of liberality, v. 24 a: distributing money and other kinds of assistance with a free hand. Under God's blessing such a person presents the paradox of increasing in this world's goods, instead of decreasing. The soul of blessing (literally), that is, the liberal person, who unselfishly shares with others, shall be made fat, be recompensed richly, by the Lord.—A special form of this liberality is that of refusing to speculate with the products of the soil, v. 26 b, ready to sell to others as they require grain to sustain life. Job 29:13.—Making every effort to put God-given blessings to good use. Such people are called righteous, v. 28 b, and the promise upon them is that they shall flourish as a branch, Ps. 1:3.

b. Of the use of all other talents and spiritual gifts of God. If a person uses all diligence, makes every effort, toward establishing that which is good and beneficial, he will be rewarded by the good will, the favor, of those who are benefited by his kindness, v. 27 a.—The Lord Himself concurs in this favorable attitude, since, under His blessing, the righteous in all their relationships in life will be like a tree that brings forth good fruit in abundance, v. 30 a. It is in this way that the righteous becomes a winner of souls, gaining them for the Lord by virtue of his righteous conduct, as suggested in 1 Pet. 3:1. Cp. Dan. 12:3; 1 Cor. 9:19; James 5:20.

The summary of the whole paragraph is given in the concluding verse, v. 31. The righteous receives the Lord's merciful reward, while the wicked and sinners must suffer the just judgment and condemnation of the Lord.

P. E. KRETZMANN

## Second Sunday after Trinity

Judg. 2:1-12

The Romans under Coriolanus had routed the enemy in battle. As they began their pursuit, they begged their general, who was half dead with wounds and fatigue, to retire to the camp. "It is

not for the victor to tire of the battle," was the reply of Coriolanus as he joined in the onward rush of his men.

The Israel of our text after glorious conquests grew weary of waging the Lord's battle and came to grief. "These things are written for our admonition." Let us renew our ardor with the thought:

**"It Is Not for the Victor to Tire of Battle"**

Such weariness

1. *Is utterly disgraceful*    2. *Unless driven off, will prove disastrous*

1

"From Gilgal to Bochim," v. 1 — significant phrase. Gilgal was the Plymouth Rock of the Pilgrim Fathers for Israel (Josh. 4:19) and for years the headquarters of Israel as it marched from victory unto victory under the invincible Captain of the Lord's hosts who had appeared to Joshua near Gilgal at the beginning of "the wars of Canaan" (Josh. 5:13 ff.). And now Bochim (the Weepers), where Israel wept at their disgrace brought home to them by that Captain, the Angel of the Lord, the Pre-Incarnate Christ (1 Cor. 10:4, 9), whom they had forgotten. (On the Angel of the Lord see Pieper, *Dogmatik*, I, p. 477 ff.) The Angel's rebuke requires the background of chapter I. Bring out briefly.

Would the Israelites become Canaanites? Not if the Angel of the Lord can prevent it. Matt. 9:13; Luke 15:2. His message at Bochim (2:1-3) reminds them of His deliverance and constant faithfulness (v. 1), His commands (v. 2 a) and threats (v. 3); confronts them with their sin and probes their conscience with an unanswerable "Why?" (v. 2 b). Silence and tears! Their disgrace indeed called for tears.

The question of Paul in Gal. 5:7 is applicable to many a church that has grown sluggish in its appointed warfare, disgracefully forgetful of the Church's mission and its conquering Lord. The Church must be *militant* until Canaan is fully possessed. Zeph. 3:16. Busy hands are needed in the Church's task of breaking down the Canaanite altars — not by physical force but by the Word of God. Luke 9:56; Matt. 28:18-20. Let not our ardor be cooled by real or fancied "iron chariots" or the evil example of indolent soldiers. Look rather to our Captain who *has fought* and *is fighting* in the *thick of the fray*, Mark 16:19, 20. Under Him victory is sure. But when His presence, His commands, His promises, are left out of account and the Church looks only to the fancied "insuperable" difficulties, the Church loses its victorious power and sinks. Matt. 14:30. Nay, "it is not for the victor to tire of battle."

## 2

It is to be feared that the tears at Bochim were prompted by the threatened punishment rather than by true repentance. We see further decline. Weeping without a return to obedience is not true repentance, and sacrifice without a forsaking of sin is offensive to God. 1 Sam. 15:22. It is a sad contrast that the second generation presents over against the generation that fought the wars of Canaan under Joshua and the elders. These "served the Lord," vv. 6-9, while the new generation "knew not the Lord," etc., v. 10. They may have had head knowledge, but the light of faith was extinguished in the heart; cp. Deut. 32:15. Unbelief, fear, weariness of fighting, worldliness, tolerance of evil; then tolerance leads to actual defection, vv. 11, 12, and defection to disaster. The threats of Bochim are fulfilled. The Book of Judges tells the story.

The moment we sense weariness in our God-appointed struggle, we must renew our vision of the "great works of the Lord" and in sincere repentance take up the fight with new vigor. If weariness is not driven off, it will lead to manifold disobedience, to entanglements with the world and its idols, and they will be to us as "thorns in the sides" and ruinous "snares." God had wanted Israel to be *physically* separate from the Canaanites. In judicial punishment for their unbelief Israel could no longer drive them out. God wants us Christians to keep ourselves *spiritually* separate from the world, 2 Cor. 6:14-17; Jas. 4:4; Rom. 12:2; otherwise the world will conquer us. Think of the typical cases of some of the congregations to which John wrote the Seven Letters, Rev. 2 and 3. Through ease and weariness of fighting the Lord's battles according to the Lord's directions many congregations and individual Christians have become "savorless salt," good for nothing but to be cast out.

When the Angel of the Lord comes to us and confronts us with our disobedience in the face of His unspeakable grace, let us humbly accept His rebuke and in true repentance fight as it pleases Him who has enrolled us as His soldiers, 2 Tim. 3:4. He will teach our hands to war and our fingers to fight, Ps. 144:1, and bring us at last to that blessed place where the victors shall need to learn war no more.

V. BARTLING





---

## Theological Observer

---

**Information on China.**—The April 17 issue of *America* (Roman Catholic) carries four articles on China which contain an abundance of information on present conditions in that country and its outlook for the future. A military authority, Conrad H. Lanza, sketches the wars of China since 1894, when it was quickly defeated by the Japanese and Korea was annexed by the latter. Prospects from the military point of view, so this observer says, are not reassuring. "When the Chinese retreated to their distant fastnesses in the interior, they took with them machinery which they had salvaged. Four years have gone by, and the machinery is about worn out. Neither new machinery nor parts for old are obtainable. Gasoline has nearly disappeared. Gas from charcoal has been used for running trucks, but charcoal, too, is becoming unobtainable. Transportation is breaking down. Food is lacking. There are provinces which have more than they need, but there is no way to ship the food to where it is badly wanted. Chinese clothes are mostly cotton; so are the peculiar kind of shoes which Chinese wear. There is a shortage of cotton, and the looms which were removed to the interior no longer suffice for what little cotton there is. Metal goods of all kinds are lacking. No wire for telephones, no steel for anything—not even for military needs. A year ago American air forces in China bombed Japanese installations from twenty to twenty-five times a month; but now they do so rarely—no gasoline. China claims to have located an oil field. There is no well-digging apparatus, and if there were, there are no refineries. Chinese economy is slowly but surely bogging down." Col. Lanza holds that through the Japanese blockade Chungking, China, "is being slowly and painfully strangled to death by economic pressure." According to his view the plan of the allies first to crush Hitler before bringing aid to China may be a mistaken policy.

Speaking of China from the point of view of Christian missions, Dr. Joseph P. Y. Fang, a Chinese Roman Catholic educator, says, "Three and a half million Chinese Catholics is a small proportion of the whole population of China" (which he holds is about 450 million), "but they are good Catholics of sincere faith. They may be considered rather as good citizens, but they do not belong to the ruling class because of the lack of higher education." He states that in spite of the war the Roman Catholic Church has made constant gains. Bishop Yu-pin, the first native bishop of Nanking, is said to have been an important factor in extending the influence of the Church. As to the general outlook for Christian missions he says, "It is undoubtedly true that after the war, perhaps even before the end of the war, the foreign missionaries in China will find themselves being drawn always closer to Chinese hearts and will find them much more easy to deal with than ever." Americans are highly esteemed in China, "the United States has always been regarded as the most friendly country by the Chinese people, owing to her generosity and peaceful spirit." He thinks that the visit of Archbishop Spellman in China, spoken of these days, if it eventuates, will be

viewed with much interest by the Chinese and give great aid to the Catholic cause. If the figures which he submits as to the number of Roman Catholic converts in China are correct, then his Church has made important strides forward during the last years. The adherents of Protestant churches are estimated not to number a million as yet.

A third article is written by John J. Considine, a clergyman who writes "on the economic potential of China from observations made in that country as field representative of the Fides service." That great difficulties lie ahead for China politically the following paragraph confirms. "What hope for the Communists of ruling China? They hate Japan and are bound in a United Front with Chiang Kai-shek, but in Kansu and Shensi, of the northwest, they maintain a quasi-independent realm with a quarter to a half million troops. Their organization, the Kungchangtai, loses no love on Chiang's organization, the Kuomintang, though they have great personal regard for Chiang. If Japan is defeated, they expect in turn to achieve a victory over the Kuomintang. Should they do so, China would be ruled by the radical agrarian democrats, a body calling itself Communists but, because definitely Chinese, not of the same temper as Russian communism." Of Chiang Kai-shek he has a high regard, saying, "He has tenacity, energy, initiative, is ambitious and, of necessity, ruthless." According to this authority Chiang Kai-shek wishes to promote the commercial and industrial development of his country without, however, doing it through granting special favors to foreign nations. The importation of an overabundance of foreign goods is something the generalissimo seeks to avoid. Altogether his aim is to make China a self-sufficient nation. At present, so Mr. Considine says, much wretchedness is in evidence. "While the Chinese average farm family does not live in the dire poverty of India, it is so near the level of minimum existence needs that any disaster tips it into want. Before the war, a farm family's income was said to be between 150 and 250 Chinese dollars, with the dollar rated two to one of American currency." On this same point he says, "Prof. Chiao Chi-ning, of the University of Nanking, now operating in Szechwan, estimates that of every ten men in China, the tenth would starve if the other nine were properly fed. Even in a normal year, China produces only ninety per cent of the food it requires. Another two and a half per cent is imported, but the remainder never appears; China merely tightens its belt." This writer correctly points out that unless China is brought Christianity, its development after the war may mean the building up of a colossus which will constitute a definite threat to the peace of the human family.

The fourth and last article is written by a Protestant authority on missions, the well-known Yale professor Kenneth Scott Latourette. The caption of his article is "China Faces a New World." On account of the careful study which Dr. Latourette has made of conditions in China and of its past history, his words carry peculiar weight. He writes, "In answer to the questions concerning the Chinese future, it must first be said that there is every prospect that ultimately the Chinese would build an efficient and stable government. . . . The Chinese have a genius for political organization. Before Rome made the Mediterranean world into a state, the Chinese had brought under one rule an

area not much smaller than that controlled by the Eternal City. The Roman Empire has long since disappeared, but the imperial structure of China has lasted into the present century. From time to time it has seemed to break down, but always it has been renewed and further elaborated. On the whole, it has given a good government to those under its jurisdiction. The tradition of unity has been so thoroughly established that it is highly improbable that it will be lost. The weakness of the past century must be attributed to the fact that China was then under a declining dynasty whose great days had passed. . . . When, in 1912, the dynasty was unseated, its fall carried with it the time-honored political structure. The Chinese have since been having to devise a new one. That has not been easy. A new government for 400 million people cannot be built overnight. The wonder is, not that China has been chaotic, but that it has made such amazing progress toward a new comprehensive, national administration."

Professor Latourette does not think that stability will soon be achieved. Neither does he hold that China will accept Communism, "at least not in such sense as we see Communism in Russia." As he views it, two major political difficulties have to be overcome—"The necessity of creating a new political structure for so large a mass of mankind, and political corruption." While China will go through the process of organization, it will constitute "a temptation to strong neighbors," and for its defense it will have to depend to some extent on the United States. By and by it will be strong enough to defy external enemies. After internal unity has been achieved, there will be the danger that China will endeavor to subjugate its neighbors. But Professor Latourette hopes that China will be willing "to take her place as a partner in a comprehensive international organization." "Today, many in the highest places in China are pleading for enduring co-operation among free peoples." Professor Latourette says in conclusion, "Here, too, is an opportunity for the Church. If it employs the present to strengthen its foundations in China, through its supranational fellowship the Church can reinforce those elements in Chinese tradition which make for international co-operation and can inspire Chinese with a richer vision of a united humanity than their past has taught them." Professor Latourette ought to have added that Christian missionaries must not repeat the mistake made by some of their number in the twenties who preached the social gospel and, to some extent at least, were responsible for the uprising which greatly troubled China in that decade.

We have submitted the above material because of the interest which exists in our own church body with respect to Christian missions in China and because we should be willing, as soon as there is an opportunity, to expand our work in that country and to take the message of the saving cross to as many of its unevangelized sections as lies in our power. A.

**A Living Review and Dead Seminaries.**—Under this heading the *Sunday School Times* (January 9, 1943) editorially takes notice of the hundredth anniversary of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, using the occasion to call attention to the terrible consequences of yielding the orthodox theology

for which in its essential features *Bibliotheca Sacra* has always stood. We read: "Andover Theological Seminary was, humanly speaking, the powerhouse of American Christianity in the greater part of the nineteenth century. It was splendidly manned. It poured out a continuous stream of thoroughly trained ministers. From it were organized missionary societies, educational societies, the American Tract Society [publisher, by the way, of *The New Testament With Notes*], the American Temperance Society. Its graduates pioneered the West, founded colleges, went overseas on Christ's errand. Its publishing house of Draper supplied the ministry with standard and new theological literature. Its theological organ was *Bibliotheca Sacra*, which, decade after decade, entered the studies of ministers both at home and abroad, instructing, confirming, introducing new theological thought. It was founded in 1843, a century ago, by Dr. Edward Robinson, known in his day, and even to our day, as a pioneer student of Biblical topography at a time when Palestine was a remote and dangerous land for travel and investigation." The article then describes the history of *Bibliotheca Sacra* and points out what befell Andover when it opened its doors to infidelity. We read: "The destruction of Andover by Unitarians and Modernists jointly is the most terrible branding of Unitarian 'ethics' imaginable and not the least so for being a self-branding. The Oberlin Seminary of Dr. Wright's day has faded into Laodicean theological tepidity [Dr. G. F. Wright of Oberlin was editor of the periodical from 1883—1921]. But God does not leave Himself without a witness, and the Dallas Seminary, with the old theological mouthpiece and instructor in evangelism, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, goes on its prosperous way." To this it adds by way of conclusion: "And this recalls that God's witness is sometimes of another and severe, not to say, punitive, sort. Auburn Seminary [Auburn Theological Seminary, orthodox Presbyterian, founded in 1819 in Auburn, N. Y.] associated itself with a so-called 'Affirmation,' which denied some of the most important and treasured teachings of Christianity. Shortly after, it went out of existence. Ichabod! Its evangelical glory had departed! This is what a recent visitor to it reports: 'A year or so ago Auburn Seminary closed its doors; its magnificent library was sold piecemeal, and the grounds and buildings leased to the National Youth Administration. The fine old library is now used for storage of tools and implements; another building as a machine shop for training apprentices. . . . The remnants of Auburn are tagged to Union Theological Seminary, New York City, where they are given one room and two professorships. As to the old Auburn buildings, probably the only usable portion is the chapel. It is possible that the blight which has come upon the seminary is the hand of God in judgment upon this once faithful Christian institution for allowing its name to be associated with the infamous Auburn Affirmation.'" —Both Andover Seminary (Congregational, founded in 1807) and Auburn Seminary demonstrate the destructiveness of Modernism. These once flourishing seminaries disappeared because they no longer had any helpful message to offer and any worth-while mission to perform. As Dr. L. Keyser says: "Christianity builds up, while unbelief tears down." And herein lies a warning for all of us to contend for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints. J. T. M.

**Presbyterian Notes and News.**—As the *Christian Beacon* (April 15, 1943) reports, three alumni of Faith Seminary have recently been granted permission to sail to Bolivia to labor among the Quechua Indians, under the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. According to the report "the Quechua Indians number hundreds of thousands and live in the high plateaus and valleys of the Andes Mountains, mostly at altitudes over 10,000 feet. They are direct descendants of the ancient Incas of Peru, who were ruthlessly subdued by the Spaniards and have been enslaved ever since in the bondage of Catholicism with many images of the saints and of Jesus Himself, but without the saving message of His finished work on Calvary."

The same number of the *Christian Beacon*, by the way, publishes a facsimile of the front and first editorial pages of the *Lutheran Witness* of November 25, 1941, with a fine editorial against Modernism ("A New Movement Against Modernism") by Dr. J. H. C. Fritz, which is worth re-reading by our own constituents today. The pages appear under the heading: "What was Said About the American Council when It was Organized by a Missouri Synod Lutheran Paper." The printing of the two pages shows the tremendous influence which Biblical Lutheranism is exerting upon Christian circles outside the Lutheran fold in our country. To complete the picture, we may add that the *Presbyterian Guardian* in a recent issue published on its first page a devotional meditation by Dr. O. P. Kretzmann and on a following page favorably introduced to its readers both Dr. Kretzmann and Valparaiso University.

Again, the *Presbyterian Guardian* (April 10, 1943) is entirely a "Christian Education Number" stressing among other things Christian education by means of Christian day schools, as the following paragraph shows: "The church has a responsibility to contribute to the Christian education of its baptized members; but the parents must themselves do more than simply train their child in the home. That covenant [Christian] child may not be turned over to the public school for secular education. Nor will it suffice even to turn the child over to a Christian school to be educated there. The parents must supervise all the instruction given that child. If no Christian school is available, then their task is indeed difficult. But even if a Christian day school is available, that school must be the servant of the parent. The type of instruction given in a Christian school should be the same, though more diversified, than the child has been receiving in preschool days in his Christian home." The general thought of the article is that the Christian child should receive a Christian education at home and that this Christian education should be continued and augmented in a Christian day school under the supervision of the Christian parents. The Lutheran Church will fulfill the great mission which it has in our country, not by accommodating itself to liberal church elements, but by showing to others the glory and beauty of faithfully adhering to God's Word. This very mission calls for a united Lutheran Church, standing foursquare on God's Word and the Lutheran Confessions in teaching and practice.

J. T. M.



**Brief Items.**—In a lecture delivered in Denver Dr. Truman B. Douglas of Pilgrim Church of St. Louis stated, "It is the opinion of reliable church historians that more people have died for their Christian faith during the last thirty years than in all preceding history." Thinking of the tragedies that have happened in the Baltic provinces and in sections of Russia proper, one must say that the statement probably is not so wide of the truth as at first glance it may appear to be.

On March 17 there died in Detroit a nationally known Methodist minister, Dr. Merton S. Rice, who was much in demand as a special preacher and lecturer. He reached the age of 71.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has opened correspondence with the patriarch of Constantinople, ranking figure in the Eastern Orthodox Church. He found that official cordially responsive to his effort to bring Eastern and Western Christianity more closely together, according to the International Christian Press and Information service.

#### *Christian Century*

In a review appearing in *America* (Roman Catholic) of Reinhold Niebuhr's new book *"The Nature and Destiny of Man, Vol. II (Human Destiny)"* the reviewer voices the complaint "Even the passé indictment of the Papacy as 'Anti-Christ' is dusted off and blessed as 'religiously correct.'" It is indeed startling that a Modernist calls the Pope the Anti-christ. Luther evidently had solid ground under his feet when he made the identification.

"In the twentieth century, war will be dead, the scaffold will be dead, hatred will be dead, frontier boundaries will be dead, dogmas will be dead, but man will live." So spoke one of the wise men of the world of the last century, one of the greatest geniuses of France, Victor Hugo. How much more correct his prognostication would have been if he had said, "In the twentieth century, war will be alive, the scaffold will be alive, hatred will be alive, frontier boundaries will be alive, and all will fear that soon the universe will be told, Man is dead."

At the National Lutheran Council, held in Minneapolis January 27—29, action was taken "providing for the creation of a special committee of sixteen members to be appointed by the eight groups participating in the Council charged with the responsibility of planning a conference of representatives of all Lutheran groups in the Western Hemisphere." This pertains to the plan which Dr. Poppen, President of the American Lutheran Church, submitted to his own church body and which has since then been brought to the attention of other Lutheran synods in our country.

The National Fellowship of Brethren Churches in its 1942 meeting declared concerning the Federal Council, "This organization does not represent the position of a large number of Protestant churches and a vast number of Christians who believe in the absolute inspiration of the Bible as the authoritative voice of God." The resolution was adopted "That we, the National Fellowship of Brethren Churches, ask the Federal Communications Commission to recognize as our Protestant voice the American Council of Christian Churches." A.

---

## Book Review

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

**Jesus in Action.** By Benjamin W. Robinson, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1942. 217 pages, 5×8. Price, \$1.50.

What gives this book distinction is that it was written by a well-trained, mature New Testament scholar who wielded a graceful pen. We have to use the past tense in speaking of him because he died last summer, being still in the fifties. Those that have read one or several of his books—he was the author of *The Life of Paul*, *The Gospel of John*, *The Abingdon Bible Commentary on First Peter*, and *The Sayings of Jesus*—know his thorough scholarship and his gifts as a writer, and whoever was personally acquainted with him will gladly recall his genial, winsome personality. The Chicago Theological Seminary, in which he occupied the chair of New Testament Interpretation, is Congregational in its denominational affiliation.

The book is not intended to be a life of Jesus or a commentary on the Gospels. It draws attention to special aspects of Jesus' work and teaching, explaining at the same time some matters that strike the reader as obscure and laying stress on passages which without a guide or commentator would be given scant notice. In the preface (p. V) the author says, "It is hoped that there is nothing sectarian in this book. It is written for Christians and modern thinkers of whatever creed or Church." Accordingly controversial subjects are avoided. The question What think ye of Christ? is not dwelt on—a real weakness of the book, though undoubtedly a result of the author's plan not to enter the sphere of polemics. The work is divided into four parts having these headings: The Positive Personality, The Positive Program, Positive Use of Previous Religion, The Positive Teaching. As these captions indicate, the author wishes to emphasize that the teaching of Jesus was positive rather than negative, that in his exposition of the Christian life the "Thou Shalt Not" has not nearly the prominence of the "Thou Shalt," especially of the law of love in its various applications. In his attitude toward Gospel criticism the author, as the preface shows (p. V), shares the views of negative higher critics but of the less radical kind. Jesus is described as Savior, but not as the Substitute for sinners. "The death of Christ is not to appease His Father's wrath, but to infuse new life into the world. Failure to accept His death is to fail of having life. He gave His life as a vicarious sacrifice, not in the sense of a 'rigid satisfaction, death for death,' but as a ransom which bought for many that positive spiritual liberty which was so dear to His heart" (p. 92 f.). The precise way in which through the death of Christ the spiritual liberty was purchased and the meaning of spiritual liberty in this context are not explained.

The book abounds in helpful glimpses as to the meaning of parables and sayings of Jesus. Concerning the kingdom of God the author

believes that the term refers to a force, an energy (p. 186). "The kingdom of God is simply a divine power of love viewed as a force taking effect in ways as wide and varied as the life and history of mankind and of the earth it inhabits" (p. 184). After many years of occupation with the Gospels we hold the position of Zahn that the term at times designates the rule or the reign of God, but at other times the divine kingdom in a concrete sense, namely, a society or a group of which God (Christ) is the Head. Professor Robinson himself admits with respect to the latter significance that "Jesus Himself used similar language when He spoke of entering the kingdom of God" (p. 186). But he holds that if one reads at one sitting all the statements of Jesus on the kingdom of God, one will have to conclude that what the Savior is speaking of is "a force which is acting in a thousand ways and producing a thousand effects." The subject has been written on voluminously during the last hundred years, but it still requires the earnest study of every theologian.

There are many other points concerning which we should like to express agreement or disagreement. The above will suffice to draw attention to the book which, though tinged by Modernism, contains much that is useful and stimulating.

W. ARNDT

**Religion in Colonial America.** By William Warren Sweet. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 367 pages, 6½×9¼. Price, \$3.00.

We are glad that Dr. Sweet of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago has been able to issue the first volume of his projected three-volume history of religion in America. There is a real need for this work. It is now fifty years since the American Church History Series was published. In reality this set is not an integrated study of church history but a collection of volumes in which the various denominations are treated as units. Dr. Sweet's approach is entirely different, for he integrates and correlates the pertinent events and influences in Colonial history and weaves them into a meaningful pattern. The reputation of our author as a thorough scholar is firmly established. The bibliography in the present volume covering sixteen pages and including all the recent studies in the field of Colonial history bears witness to Dr. Sweet's scholarship. And we know from personal experience that he examines his sources carefully. We saw him work on photostatic copies of source material on the Franconian settlements in Michigan in order to guide Homer R. Greenholt, a candidate for the doctorate, in writing his thesis: "A Study of William Loehe, his Colonies, and the Lutheran Indian Missions in the Saginaw Valley of Michigan."

The present volume traces the transplanting of the European churches to America during the seventeenth and the gradual Americanization of the churches during the eighteenth century. To understand the modern religious scene in America, an acquaintance with the genetic history of the various denominations is almost indispensable. Our volume supplies this information in a scholarly and yet highly interesting manner. The analysis of early Anglicanism in America will lead to a better understanding of the present Episcopal Church. The chapter on the Puritan settlements is particularly illuminating. Dr. Sweet shows that "to the Puritan leaders in New England democracy was a dangerous thing in

a government such as theirs, pledged to carry out God's will; for, they asked, 'How could ungodly rulers know the will and purposes of God?' Thus they felt under the necessity of keeping the godly minority in control. Winthrop argued that there was no democracy in Israel, and that among civil states it was the meanest form of government" (p. 85). The Puritan form of government was not, strictly speaking, theocratic, but, according to Dr. Sweet, "more Erastian, which is to say that the Church was indirectly concerned in government, but that the government was directly concerned with the affairs of the Church" (p. 89). Roman Catholics often claim that Rome is the real mother of our democratic ideals, because the Baltimores were the first to grant religious liberty in their Maryland colony. But Dr. Sweet shows conclusively that this is, "to put it mildly, misleading," for Romanists were tolerant not of other people's, but of their own religious freedom, even as "minorities are always in favor of toleration whatever their real principles might be" (p. 131). Since Dr. Sweet treats the various immigration groups together, the German Lutherans are discussed in the chapter in which all the early German immigrants are treated: the Mennonites, Dunkers, Schwenkfeldians, Moravians, Reformed. Another reason why he groups the German Lutherans and Reformed with the German sectaries is the fact that a "pietistic strain was common to them all (the various German groups) in colonial America" (p. 211).

The second part of the volume shows the tremendous influences of the Great Awakening on the American cultural, social, moral, and particularly the political life. He traces briefly the abnormal psychological phenomena which attended the revivals under Frelinghuysen, Edwards, Tennent, Davies, and especially the twenty-six-year-old Whitefield. Dr. Sweet makes this significant observation: "Miss Winslow [in her book, *Jonathan Edwards*] has well pointed out that success came to Whitefield too soon and too easily, resulting in his stunted growth, for at the end of his career he was preaching the same kind of sermons as in his youth, and there was no indication of an enlargement of view or of deepening wisdom" (p. 187) — an observation which every young pastor might well ponder before accepting a call to a very large parish. But the chapter on the Great Awakening deserves careful study, chiefly because it points out the important contributions which the churches made to the formulation of the American ideals of liberty, how the unionizing tendencies of the revivals welded the colonists together, how the Quaker and Baptist principles led to the separation of Church and State. However, we believe that Luther's ideal of religious liberty — to which Dr. Sweet refers only in passing, p. 320, n. — was a direct influence in the founding of our democracy. Qualben, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 439, n., states that Jefferson studied Luther's treatise *Liberty of the Christian Man* in a Lutheran parsonage two months prior to the Declaration of Independence, and Dr. Wm. Dallmann calls my attention to a statement in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* that Jefferson studied "an old abstract of Lutheran doctrine on the way to writing the Declaration of Independence." There were numerous streams which met in the momentous decades prior to the Revolutionary War, and the Lutheran

stream is one of the important ones and should therefore receive more attention in the chapter discussing the unchurched Liberals. (P. 334 ff.)

Dr. Sweet does not write a history of doctrine. His interests lie chiefly in showing the close correlation between the cultural and the religious life of the colonists. This accounts for the fact that relatively little is said about doctrine and doctrinal controversies. Only one page is devoted to the New England theology. The standard work on this important phase of American church history, Foster's *Genetic History of New England Theology*, is not included in the otherwise complete bibliography. More space should have been given to the basic principle of Roger Williams, the right and competency of the individual soul in all matters of religion, and its importance for the development of Baptist theology. Naturally, one will not agree with every historical or doctrinal judgment, for example: "The principal difference between the Quakers and Luther in respect to the universal priesthood was that they put into actual practice what he had advanced only as a doctrine." (P. 163.) Luther's universal priesthood is unthinkable without the Word as the only means of grace, whereas Quakers dispense with the Word entirely. We also question the statement that John Wesley separated himself from the Moravian Society because "it was not big enough for the things he felt needed to be done" (p. 228). Wesley withdrew from the Moravians because his theology was basically different from the antinomianism of the Herrnhut group. A second printing will also correct such typographical errors as Grobner for Graebner, pp. 237 and 349, and Salzberger for Salzburger. We have placed this book on the reserve shelf for our class in Comparative Symbolics and recommend it highly for an understanding of our American religious scene. F. E. MAYER

**The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg.** Translated by Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein. Published by the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States and The Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia. Vol. I. 728 pages, 7×10. Price, \$10.00 for three volumes by subscription.

It was fitting that in the year 1942 there should come off the press the first volume of *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, for that year marked the two hundredth anniversary of Muhlenberg's coming to America. The publishers inform us that the other two volumes will appear in 1943 and 1944 respectively.

We wish to congratulate the Muhlenberg Press for its farsightedness in publishing this great work and thus making available in the English language source material of real value to the student of history. It will be a blessed day for the Lutheran Church in the English-speaking world when other great Lutheran classics from German and Scandinavian sources are similarly put into English dress, and the various Lutheran groups in our country, together with their publishing houses, will do well to set themselves to the task. No one, we are confident, will doubt the wisdom of such a program; and there should not be competition among us, but co-operation, as we shall all derive the benefits therefrom. It would seem eminently important to this reviewer that a conference be held by those who are interested, at an early date, and that a plan be drawn up and a publication program agreed upon.



It will not be necessary for this review to enter upon the details of Muhlenberg's life as a survey of his career appeared in the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* last year. This volume of the *Journal* begins with an entry dated Jan. 2, 1742, and ends with an entry dated Dec. 31, 1763. The years 1711-1742 are covered by an account of that period from a revision prepared by Muhlenberg in 1782 and published in the *Selbstbiographie*.

Thus the *Journal* relates the story of Muhlenberg's coming to America, his contacts with the Salzburger in Georgia, his arrival in Philadelphia, and his handling of the confused situation he found among the congregations which had called him to this country, his work up to and including the founding of the first permanent Lutheran synod on American soil, and the busy and trying fifteen years after that historic organization.

Muhlenberg was thirty-one years old when the *Journal* began and fifty-two at the close of this volume, which thus gives us the detailed picture of twenty-one years of his active life.

The translators, in their valuable introduction to this volume, tell us how the *Journals* were written:

The journals themselves throw considerable light on the way in which they were written. It appears to have been Muhlenberg's practice to make sketchy notes day by day. A few of these original notes are still extant. Those which he prepared in New York during May, 1752, he called "annotations." Similar notes for part of the year 1775 he called "fragments, i. e., bones without sinews and muscles." These daily notes consist of names of persons and places and a few mnemonic symbols or words. They were intended to serve as pegs for his memory. Then when he was released for a time from the necessities of travel or the pressure of official duties, he expanded these notes by putting "sinews and muscles" on the "bones." A single name or word was often expanded to a page or more. In this process of filling in his original notes, Muhlenberg sometimes introduced anachronisms. "She did not tell me during this visit," he wrote, for example, "but I learned later. . . ." The replies to letters are occasionally indicated under the dates on which letters were written. When Muhlenberg altered his opinion about events or persons, the later, more mature judgments were sometimes inserted under dates when he held opinions which were quite different. This will explain some apparent chronological inconsistencies between Muhlenberg's correspondence and his journals.

In addition we are told that he used goose quills and made his own ink for writing. He had to buy his own paper, which was expensive, and he therefore often used half-filled books which were intended to serve other purposes. The tedious work of copying he did when he found time, but he also used copyists.

Another paragraph of the introduction is interesting, not only for its insight into Muhlenberg's linguistic ability, but also because of the light it sheds on the antiquity of what we now call "Pennsylvania German":

Although the journals were written in German, Muhlenberg employed other languages. He wrote and received letters in English, Dutch, and Latin as well as in German, and copies of these letters were sometimes transcribed into the journals in the original languages. Muhlenberg also made frequent use of common Latin expressions, and occasionally he inserted a Greek word or two. But of particular interest in

this connection is the fact that, while Muhlenberg never completely mastered either English or Dutch, his German lost something of its purity. He was aware that "old Germans" in America "spoil the English language and in time produce a third language, which is neither English nor German." The same temptation confronted Muhlenberg. He not only adopted Latin and French words by the simple expedient of furnishing them with German suffixes—a not uncommon practice in the eighteenth century—but he also incorporated a large number of English words and idioms into his speech. The result can best be illustrated by a few examples:

Am Abend wurde es mit meinem Beruf *gesettelt*  
 Wir *stopten* unterwegs  
 Es wurde mir *allowirt*  
 Welches in meinem Kirchen-Buche *recorded* ist  
 Er hat unter Englichen *geservet* und seine Sprache  
   vergessen  
 Sie wolte gern bey uns *boarden*  
 Der Satan hatte sie *encouragirt*  
 Mr. Keple war damit nicht *gepleaset*  
 Welcher *employirt* werden moechte  
 Die *Deeds* sind *recorded*  
 Ich hatte vielen Ueberlauf und *Trouble*  
 Es war nicht in die *Minutes* geenter'd  
 Er hatte drey *Deeds* zu *acknowledgen*  
 Als ich Abends *alle in* war  
 Ich hatte 'was in dem *Stohr gepurchas'd*

This admixture of English with German, while not nearly so pronounced as in the case of some others, proceeded rapidly. He was using such expressions as are listed above within ten years of his arrival in America and continued to use them to the end of his life. That the authorities in Halle were occasionally mystified appears from some of their attempts to put these expressions into German.

We recommend the *Journals* to our readers. The cost of the three volumes is by no means too high, and the value which the interested pastor will receive from a careful perusal of the contents will amply repay him for his investment. It is not a work which will be read once and then laid away, but it will be read and re-read, and we dare say the pastor's wife and grown children will also like to browse around in it.

W. G. POLACK

**The American Origin of the Augustana Synod.** From Contemporary Lutheran Periodicals, 1851—1860. A Collection of Source Material Gathered and Edited by O. Fritiof Ander and Oscar L. Nordstrom with an Introduction by George M. Stephenson. 192 pages. 6×9. Augustana Historical Society, Rock Island, Ill., 1942.

This is volume nine of the Augustana Historical Society publications. It is a reprint of documents, most of them hidden in old periodicals like the *Lutheran Observer*, the *Olive Branch*, also in the minutes of the Augustana Synod. The documents cover the years 1851 to 1860. We find interesting data here regarding the State University of Illinois, organized at Springfield, later occupied by Concordia Seminary. Most of the documents are concerned with the relationships between the various Lutheran bodies in the State of Illinois. Those who have been led to believe that Lutheranism outside the Synodical Conference presents the picture of churches long on a doctrinal decline should read

these pages and be convinced that attitudes such as were espoused by Lutheran spokesmen in the 50's towards the Lutheran Confessions have given way to far more conservative habits of thought both in the Augustana Synod and in the bodies now forming the United Lutheran Church. Professor L. P. Esbjorn and other leaders of that distant time live again in these reprints, and we are permitted to follow in detail the discussions which have led to the present obligation of all Lutheran pastors in America on the Symbols of our Church, whereas ninety years ago men fought for the principle of "receiving the confessions in a qualified sense," as was sponsored by the General Synod in those days. Practically the entire book is given over to this development of confessional consciousness, the debate centering around the "State University of Illinois."

TH. GRAEBNER

**Christian Worship.** By W. A. Sloan, A.M., Th.D. The Herald Press, Louisville, Kentucky. 114 pages, 5½×7½. Price, \$1.00.

Books on worship have been coming from the presses of various publishing houses in increasing numbers ever since the *Hochkirchliche Bewegung* in Germany instigated a liturgical renaissance both abroad and in America. The present monograph represents, on the whole, an attempt to offer acceptable views in the field of Christian worship. Some passages are valuable for both pastor and people, as when the author speaks of the purpose of church music (p. 61), or when he deprecates the use of the sermon as an occasion for self-display or a sensational exhibition (p. 79). One can, indeed, get much stimulating thought from the book. However, it is inadequate from the standpoint of *Lutheran* worship, and for a number of reasons. Some Scripture passages which are not pertinent to the argument are apparently quoted on account of the sound of the words. The explanation of John 4:24 hardly does justice to the Lord's remark. The Lord's Supper is no mere symbol (p. 68). Truth is not merely subjectively the opposite of falsehood, but it is objectively the Word of God. Worship is not a mere intensification of the religious feeling in man, but a drawing close to Him on the basis of the Gospel promises, to render to Him the homage of the heart, the sacrifice of the lips, and the service of the whole person. One misses throughout the book the emphasis on this objective basis of worship, on the instrumentality of the Gospel in effecting the right attitude of the heart and mind. Those who purchase this volume will do well to keep in mind the definition of divine worship offered in the *Concordia Cyclo-pedia*: "(Divine worship is) according to the Lutheran view not merely an approach to God in prayer, praise, and thanksgiving (commonly known as the sacrificial elements of worship), but chiefly an acceptance of God's gift of grace to men, through the means of grace (the sacramental element)."

P. E. KRETMANN

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn.:*

**The Gospel of the Grace of God.** By J. Clyde Turner. 165 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.

*From the Warner Press, Anderson, Indiana:*

**Wonderful Jesus.** By Charles S. Ludwig. 127 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.